This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

14452.17.55

HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

14452.17.5

HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

THE WORKS

OF

FULKE GREVILLE

A THESIS

By MORRIS W. CROLL

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

University of Pennsylvania
1901

PHILADELPHIA
PRINTED BY J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY
1903

14452.17.55

~~14452.17.55~~

HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

52.17.55
~~14452.18~~

HARVARD COLLEGE
AUG 14 1902
LIBRARY.

Univ. of Pennsylvania

THE WORKS OF FULKE GREVILLE

I

THE SONNET-SEQUENCE *CAELICA*

The beginning of the history of Greville's literary work is in some lines of a *Pastoral* by Sidney called *Dispraise of a Courtly Life*,

> Well was I, while vnder shade
> Oaten reedes me musicke made;
> Striuing with my mates in song,
> Mixing mirth our songs among.

—a marginal note on the manuscript of this poem telling us that the mates referred to are Edward Dyer and Fulke Greville.[1] The poem was probably written at some time during the years 1578 and 1579, when we know that Sidney was chafing bitterly at his enforced idleness at the court. The fraternity of the three young men to which it alludes was probably formed during the years 1568-71, when they were all at college, Sidney and Dyer at Oxford, Greville at Cambridge; and it may be assumed that the writing of verses was one of the amusements with which they adorned their college companionship. But in the years following, their association was principally in foreign travel and diplomacy, and it was not until Sidney began in 1576-7 the life of a courtier, with its quieter intervals of country retirement, that they had leisure to strive with one another in song under the shade of the groves of Wilton and Penshurst. In the years following, from 1577 to 1583, Sidney produced all of the works that we possess from his pen, and it is reasonable to suppose that during all of that period Greville was sharing with him in his literary amusements as in virtually all of his other activities. The question whether or not any of the poems in *Caelica* are the results of this early writing can only be decided by a careful study of the sequence, and the only verse not included in *Caelica* that has been supposed to have been written by Greville before Sidney's

[1] This is one of two similar poems, celebrating the friendship of Dyer, Greville and Sidney, first published in Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody*. See *The Miscellaneous Works of Sir Philip Sidney*, Boston, 1860, and *The Complete Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. by Dr. Grosart, 1877, Vol. II, p. 32.

death, namely, the poem beginning "In youth when I at large did leade," published in *The Paradise of Dainty Devices* (1578) and signed "F. G.," is certainly not by Greville.[1]

The outward record of Greville's early literary life not only begins but ends with these lines from Sidney's *Pastoral*, unless there is evidence, as most writers have thought, that Greville was a member of the famous "Areopagus" club. This subject requires some attention. All the writers who discuss this shadowy institution include Greville's name among its members, Mr. Gosse, Mr. Lee,[2] Mr. Symonds,[3] Mrs. Ward,[4] Dr. Grosart,[5] and more recently Dr. Spingarn.[6] Mr. Gosse, who alone gives a reason for doing so, quotes as evidence the lines from Sidney's *Pastoral* just given;[7] but if there is nothing more than this to support Greville's claim, it must be given up at once. For there is surely enough of rhymed verse in the *Arcadia* to indicate that Sidney may have striven with his mates without imposing the restrictions of quantitative verse as one of the rules of the competition.

There is, in fact, no evidence that Greville either practised or approved unrhymed classical metres in English. The references on which the history of the Areopagus depends are in the letters of Spenser and Harvey published as *Two other verie commendable Letters*. Both Harvey and Spenser mention the club by name. Harvey's words are: "Your new-formed ἀρειοπαγον I honoure more than you will or can suppose: and make greater accompte of the twoo worthy gentlemenne, than of the two hundredth *Dionysii Areopagitae*, or the verie notablest senatours, that ever Athens dydde affourde of that number."[8] Spenser

[1] Printed by Grosart—though he did not believe in Greville's authorship—with his Minor Poems; Vol. II, pp. 140-3. The edition of Greville's works by Grosart in four volumes, 1870, of which only 156 copies were printed, is the only form in which Greville's works are generally accessible. I have had the benefit of a comparison with the first edition both of the Folio of 1633 (containing *Caelica*, the plays, the treatises of "Humane Learning," "Fame and Honor," and "Warres," etc.), and of *The Remains of Sir Fulk Greville*, 1670 (containing the treatises of "Monarchy" and of "Religion"). There is a copy of the former in the Library of the University of Pennsylvania, and of the latter in the Philadelphia Library. The other original edition is of the *Life of Sidney*, 1652, and I have compared this also with Grosart's edition, in a copy owned by myself.

[2] *Dict. of Nat. Biog. s. n.* Greville.

[3] *Life of Sidney*, English Men of Letters series, p. 73.

[4] *English Poets*, Vol. 1.

[5] His edition of the *Poetical Works of Sidney*, 1, p. lxxv.

[6] *Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, New York, 1899, p. 300.

[7] His statement is particularly misleading. He says: "Almost the only reference to the famous Areopagus includes their names [Dyer's and Greville's]." *Sir Philip Sidney, Contemporary Review*, 1, p. 642.

[8] Grosart's edition of Harvey, Vol. 1, p. 20.

says: "As for the twoo worthy Gentlemen, Master Sidney and Master Dyer, they haue me, I thanke them, in some vse of familiarity: . . . And nowe they have proclaimed in their ἀρειωπάγῳ a general surceasing and silence of balde Rymers, and also of the verie beste to: in steade whereof, they haue, by authoritie of their whole Senate, prescribed certaine Lawes and rules of Quantitie of English sillables for English Verse." [1]

There is no mention here of Greville; and, on the contrary, two of the well-known triad, all poets, are chosen for distinct mention to the exclusion of the third. We look for other evidence on the subject to Greville's own poems, and we find there but one trace of the influence of the classical movement. Sonnet 6 in *Caelica* is an echo in form and substance of the seven stanzas of "Saphikes" sung by Zelmane in the First Book of *Arcadia;* [2] but it is curious that in this single case where Greville has used a classical metre he has added rhyme to it.[3] It is evident at least that Greville did not share the dislike of "barbarous rhyming" that distinguished the more ardent hexametrists. But there are further indications of his position. In 1602 Campion renewed the controversy in his *Observations on the Art of English Poesie,* the last attack of the classical metrists, and was answered at once by Daniel in *A Defence of Ryme,* which appeared in the same year.[4] In a prefatory address "To All the Worthy Lovers and Learned Professors of Ryme, within his Maiesties Dominions," Daniel says:

> Worthy Gentlemen, about a year since, upon the great reproach given to the Professors of Ryme, and the use thereof, I wrote a private letter, as a defence of mine owne undertakings in that kinde, to a learned Gentleman a great friend of mine, then in Court. Which I did, rather to confirme my selfe in mine owne courses, and to hold him from being wonne from us, then with any desire to publish the same to the world.

The correspondent to whom Daniel thus refers is, on the authority of the editors of this work, Greville, and it is to be presumed that the first edition contains some authority marginal or other, for this identification.[5] Daniel's words are not decisive on the point, but they seem to show that Greville was in fact one of the "Lovers and Learned

---

[1] Grosart's edition of Harvey, Vol. 1, p. 7.

[2] 1633 ed. of *Arcadia*, Book 1, p. 78.

[3] In the Third Book of *Arcadia* there is a rhymed poem of apparently the same form, but in fact the lines are the regular English five-stressed iambics, a b a b.

[4] Hazlewood, *Ancient Critical Essays*, London, 1811, Vol. II.

[5] I have not been able to see Grosart's ed., Vol. IV, where I suppose the facts are given. The editors to whom I refer are Hazlewood and Mr. Ernest Rhys, editor of *Literary Pamphlets* (Vol. I).

Professors of Ryme." There is another record of this correspondence besides Daniel's mention of his own letter, showing that Greville also took part in the discussion. The article on Greville in the *Biographia Britannica*, of 1757, a careful and excellent biography and the source of much later writing on the subject, contains the following:

> Between whom (Daniel and Sir Fulk Greville) there passed an intercourse of several letters, upon some improvements or reformation that had been proposed to be made, in the masques, interludes, or other dramatical entertainments at Court. . . . Their sentiments they also exchanged in writing, upon the topic of our English versification, about the time that Daniel had his controversy with Campion thereupon, and Sir Fulk's judgment is often applauded, with his munificence to several practitioners therein.[1]

This affords no clue to Greville's position, but we have the evidence both of his ordinary practise and of his theory of poetry to show that he probably always followed the poetic forms in which he found least resistance to the difficult and weighty things he had to say, and if his letters should be recovered they would most likely show the same indifference to the relative merits of the two sides of the controversy that he shows in the case of the two systems of astronomy. At all events there is nothing to prove that he took part in the proposed reform of English versifying.

To the external evidence concerning Greville's literary activity, might be added, if they were not so vague and confusing, various statements, made long after, as to the time of the composition of his works. Greville himself, in his *Life of Sidney*, written not long before his death, calls his collected poems "the exercises of my youth," but the collection to which he referred was to contain the *Treatise of Monarchy*, which, as we shall see, was probably not written before Greville's fiftieth year. Similar statements were made by Davenant[2] and by the publisher of the 1670 volume, with the further mention of a revision by Greville of all his works later in his life; and the title page of the 1633 Folio is more definite still; it describes the poems as "Written in his Youth, and familiar Exercise with sir Philip Sidney." These latter words, however, which have been taken too seriously, are of course the work of the publisher, and are due to the confusion of two neighboring phrases of Greville's own in the passage quoted from

[1] Vol. IV, p. 2400, note K. The writer of the article, who had evidently seen these letters, gives as the reference for them: "*A Miscellany of Historical and Poetical Remarks, gathered in the reign of King James 1*, 4to among the MSS. of the late Thomas Coxeter, Esq." Mr. J. A. Herbert, of the Dep't of MSS. in the British Museum, writes to me that the Coxeter MS. is not there.

[2] That is, according to Aubrey. *Brief Lives*, ed. by Andrew Clark, 1898, 1, p. 294.

above.[1] In view of the doubtful meaning of all such statements, we must leave the discussion of the date of the works to the sections in which we shall speak of them separately.

I

The sequence called *Caelica* consists of one hundred and ten poems, of which the first eighty express the love of the poet for a mistress whom he calls Caelica, Myra, or Cynthia, as his fancy directs, but in the latter part of which he writes, as Habington does in the latter part of his *Castara,* only on general and impersonal themes. It is remarkable for the fact that about one-half of the so-called sonnets are in other than the regular fourteen-line form, for the unevenness of the merit of the various poems, and because the sonnet is used in this sequence for purposes to which it was turned by no other poet during its Elizabethan flourishing. For all these reasons it has attracted the attention of the critics, but the general expressions of interest or amazement which its peculiar qualities have inspired have been mingled with uncertainty as to its date, errors as to the subject-matter of the poems, misconception of the story involved in it, and misinterpretation of its true literary significance. One instance of the general uncertainty will serve for illustration. Mr. Gosse, treating Greville in his *Jacobean Poets,* says: "His existing works appear to belong, in the main, to the post-Elizabethan period; the cycle of *Caelica,* which seems to date from the close of the sixteenth century, being excepted;"[2] and Mr. Courthope probably holds the same opinion, since he has nothing to say of Greville in his latest volume, though he writes in full of Sidney, Dyer, Raleigh, and Essex, his fellow courtier-poets. But Mrs. Ward, on the other hand, writes of his works as of Sidney's time, relying on the title-page of 1633;[3] while Professor Schelling, though classifying his selections from Greville with those from Sidney, expresses the opinion that "*Caelica* exhibits very decidedly . . . a deepening maturity of mind, and may have been written through a series of years."[4] The contradictions, however, with whatever errors are involved in them, are not in this case, or in some other similar ones, due to carelessness. They are due largely to absence of evidence and to the fact that Greville's works have never been sub-

[1] He says (*Life of Sidney,* Gr. ed., IV, p. 5): "Which I ingenuously confesse, to be one chief motive of dedicating these exercises of my youth to that Worthy, Sir Philip Sidney, so long since departed."

[2] *Jacobean Poets,* New York, 1894, p. 196.

[3] Ward's *English Poets,* I.

[4] *Elizabethan Lyrics,* Athenæum Press series, Boston, 1895.

mitted to a minute investigation.[1] It is only by a careful study of the poems themselves and the internal evidence they afford that the material for an intelligent study of Greville can be obtained; and fortunately the results of internal exploration are in the case of *Caelica* more than usually clear and decisive.

The close relation between *Caelica* and the poems of Sidney is at once the most obvious and the most significant fact revealed by such an examination. Mrs. Ward has shown that a number of the sonnets are "echoes" of sonnets and songs in *Astrophel and Stella* and suggests that the list may be extended.[2] The following is a description, as nearly complete as possible, of the similarities between individual poems in *Caelica* and individual poems of Sidney in *Astrophel and Stella* and elsewhere, too close to be due to anything but intention on the part of one or both of the poets.

1. *Caelica* 6, four stanzas in rhymed sapphics, is in direct imitation both of the form and the substance of the "Saphikes" sung by Zelmane at the end of Book I of *Arcadia*.[3]

2. *Caelica* 11 and 35 are separate elaborations of two 'Anacreontic' fancies, both of which are contained in *A and S.* 8. *C.* 11 represents the strange consequences of Cupid's banishment north of the Tropic. *C.* 35 tells of his being crippled in his wings by dwelling too long in the cold of Caelica's heart.

3. *Caelica* 12 and *A. and S.* 65: Cupid a vagabond, taken in and sheltered by the lover, who is wounded almost to death by his ungrateful guest. Compare especially the first quatrain *C.* 12 with the second of *A. and S.* 65. *C.* 15 is a working over of the same device.

4. *C.* 13 and *A and S.* 17. "Two better illustrations of poetical failure on the one hand, and such poetical success as the kind of theme admits of on the other, could scarcely be brought together than the thirteenth sonnet of *Caelica*, 'Cupid his boy's play many times forbidden,' as compared with the well-known 'His mother dear Cupid offended late' of *Astrophel and Stella*." Mrs. HUMPHREY WARD, *English Poets*, I, *Greville*.

5. *C.* 45 and the Tenth Song in *A. and S.* Though absence is a common theme of nearly every sonnetteer the subtle argument by which the lover extracts some sort of satisfaction from absence in these poems and the similarity of the metre prove their immediate connection. Sidney's Song is in stanzas of six four-stress trochaic lines of seven and eight syllables, rhyming as follows: a a b c c b; Greville's stanza is a b a b c c d e e d; so that his poem is also of the kind called 'song' by Sidney.[4]

---

[1] No disparagement of the service of Dr. Grosart in reprinting the poems is meant by this statement, since he has professedly undertaken only biography and appreciation.

[2] As above.

[3] 1633 ed. p. 78.

[4] The original of this, as of other Cupid-and-Venus fancies, of which something is said below, is in the Odes of Anacreon. Greene and Herrick also have versions of it. Of course in poems on themes so common only close resemblance can determine interrelation.

6. *C.* 46, 'Patience, weake-fortuned and weake-minded wit,' "is an exercise on the same theme as Sonnet 56 of *Astrophel and Stella*." Mrs. WARD, as above.

7. *C.* 50 and a similar rude apologue from common life, *Arcadia*, Bk. 3, pp. 390-3 (1633 edition), 'A Neighbour mine not long agoe there was.' These poems, so different in their broad and jovial satiricism from anything else in these courtly poets, fulfil all the conditions of the medieval *fabliau* and are to be classed as late examples of that species.

8. *C.* 60, 'Caelica, you said I doe obscurely live,' and *A. and S.* 27, 'Because I oft in dark abstracted guise.' This is the only case of close resemblance in which Greville has some advantage from comparison, the subtlety and sincerity of his thought compensating for his inferiority in form and lightness of fancy. The last stanza seems to be a later addition, and not a good one.

9. *C.* 76 and the Eighth Song of *A. and S.* The two poems have in common the description of a May landscape, the walk of two lovers through "an enamel'd meade" (in Greville), in "a grove most rich of shade" (in Sidney), the long silence of both, with nice analysis of their emotions, finally a long casuistic dialogue on love, in which the ardor of the lover is restrained by the prudence of his mistress, or, in Greville's case, by her anger.[1] The metrical form is the same, seven-and-eight-syllable trochaic lines rhyming in pairs, except that in Sidney's poem throughout couplets of eight-syllable trochaic lines alternate regularly with couplets of seven-syllable trochaic lines and thus the stanza effect is maintained, while in Greville's this regular alternation is observed through only about half of the poem.

This list includes only cases in which one poem is clearly prompted by the other. Another at least twice as long could be made of lines, quatrains and stanzas in *Caelica* which have been suggested by *Astrophel and Stella*. Such a minute comparison is unnecessary, but the general similarity of a certain group of sonnets in *Caelica* to a group in *Astrophel and Stella* is important in determining the relation between the two. In each of the following sonnets from *A. and S.* the motive is an elaborate Cupid-device, in the 'Anacreontic' style prevalent in all early Renaissance poetry: 8, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19, 20, 43, 65 (9 sonnets). The similar sonnets in *Caelica* are: 11, 12, 13, 15, 20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 52, 70, 85 (17 sonnets). All of these fall within so small a range of imagery and application that as a class they form a marked feature of likeness between the two cycles.

[1] Poems following this convention are numerous in later poets. Compare Donne's *The Ecstacy*, Lord Herbert's *Ode on a Question moved whether Love should continue forever*, Wither's *Fair-Virtue, The Mistress of Phil'arete*, Sonnet 3. In Donne's poem by a characteristic subtlety the dialogue is reduced to a monologue spoken by the undistinguished soul of the two lovers. There may be an original in some foreign literature, or Sidney's Song may have suggested the rest. Sedley shows the abuse of the form in various poems and Cartwright protests against the Platonism which found expression in it in his *No Platonic Love*.

Again, the metrical forms of *Caelica* are in general derived from Sidney. These will be more carefully discussed in the following section, but it is to be noted here that every form prevalent in *Caelica* is to be found either in the *Arcadia* or in *Astrophel and Stella;* and this is true not only of the regular forms, the sonnet in the form used by Surrey and Shakespeare, and the group of two to four sestettes, a b a b c c, used for practically the same effect as the sonnet proper and called 'sonnet,' but also for such variations as ten- or eighteen-line sonnets, a succession of ten-line sonnets forming a single poem (Greville's Sonnet 61 and Sidney's poem, *Wonders of England,* octettes, and seven- and eight-syllable trochaics variously used.

And finally, there is kinship between the cycles in a certain kind of resemblance which will seem accidental only to those who fail to take account of the symbolic means by which Greville expressed his veneration for Sidney's memory, namely, in their length. Sidney's cycle consists of 108 sonnets, not including the songs, which were interspersed among the sonnets after the sequence had in other respects been given its final form.[1] In *Caelica,* as reprinted by Dr. Grosart, there are 110 sonnets, but in the MS. which Greville left with his final corrections the numberings reach to the exact figure 108. This MS., which is at Warwick Castle and was sent to Dr. Grosart after his text of the *Sonnets* had appeared, evidently gives the exact form in which Greville meant his work to appear; and the difference between the number therein and the number in the reprinted form is due to two facts: first that the Warwick Castle MS. does not contain Sonnet 6, the poem in rhymed sapphics, and that this sonnet was therefore probably obtained and added by whoever took charge of the publication of the 1633 Folio (which for this reason numbers to 109); secondly, that in the MS. the same number was used for two contiguous sonnets (27 and 28 are both there 27), and this error was perpetuated in the 1633 edition. If the point were of sufficient importance one could gather other minute evidence from the MS. to show that the coincidence is not due to chance.

We have considered here only the outward similarities and not those which have to do with the spirit of the poems. We may now ask what conclusions are to be drawn from the facts presented. In the first place, it appears that all of the cases of close resemblance between individual sonnets occur in the first half of the *Caelica,* with the exception of Greville's Sonnet 76, and since this is a poem of a particular kind, such as Sidney distinguished by the name of songs, it is possible that its position is due to its having been added to the sequence with

[1] A. W. Pollard's ed. of *Astrophel and Stella,* London, 1898, p. xxxvi.

others of its kind, after the time of its composition. Moreover, of the seventeen Cupid-sonnets in *Caelica* mentioned above, fifteen are found in the first half, and fourteen before the 40th Sonnet.

In the second place, as to the kind of relationship they reveal, two opinions are possible, either that Greville, writing after Sidney's death, returned for the sake of literary exercise to the forms, the subjects and the devices used at a certain time by his friend, or that he wrote the poems in question and others of the same style in the time and under the influence of their actual companionship. The former opinion is tenable as regards one or two poems; but it is not the natural conclusion for them all. First, it is inherently the less probable; secondly, it is not in accordance with Greville's genius. Most of them are artificial and decorative inventions, in which the thing said is of less importance than the way of saying it; and Greville's pen was, as he himself knew, ill-adapted to such exercises. He never, except in the poems of which we are speaking, showed the least interest in poetry as a decorative art. Besides, it is to be remembered that Sidney recorded the actual fact of their writing in rivalry. There can be little doubt, therefore, that *Caelica* was begun between 1577 and 1583 and that many of the poems in the first half of the sequence as we have it belong to that time.

For further information as to the history of the sonnets we turn to the consideration of their metrical characteristics.

The prevailing forms, including all but thirteen of the poems, are the sonnet in the form used by Surrey, a b a b c d c d e f e f g g, and six-line stanzas (from one to twelve of such stanzas forming a poem). These forms and their variations are used as follows:

1. Sonnet in form *a b a b c d c d e f e f g g*, 41 times.
2. Sonnet in form *a b a b a b a b a b a b c c* (with identical rhyme), once (Sonnet 16).
3. Sonnet of ten lines, 7 times.
4. Sonnet of eighteen lines, 3 times.
5. Sonnet of twenty-two lines, 4 times.
6. Poem of 2 ten-line sonnets, once (Sonnet 59).
7. Poem of six-line stanzas, *a b a b c c*, 34 times.
8. Poem of eight-line stanzas, *a b a b a b c c*, 3 times.
9. Combination of sonnet and six-line stanza, 3 times:
   (*a*) Sonnet + six-line stanza + ten-line sonnet (50);
   (*b*) Ten-line sonnet + 2 six-line stanzas (70);
   (*c*) Three six-line stanzas + sonnet (109).

One, the long *Sonnet* 84, is in Poulter's Measure.

This list shows that Greville included a larger variety of forms under the name "sonnet" than any other of the sequence writers. It will perhaps also be regarded as showing that he was incapable of

moulding his material in definite forms, or at least that he was so careless of form that he allowed the natural course of his thought to determine the length and metrical character of his poem. But this is not so certain as it might appear. It is true that when Greville was most interested in what he was saying he seems to have chosen the form that offered least resistance, and also that the technical difficulties of verse-writing were unusually great for him, but it does not appear that he was therefore either careless or licentious in his verse, or that he was indifferent to formal distinctions. Some of the criticism which has been passed upon him in this respect is unjustified, inasmuch as the instances on which it is founded are instances of irregularity which Greville practised with artistic intent, or else are such irregularities as are found in other poets of the time against whom the charge of carelessness cannot be laid.[1] At least, in the case of the various arrangements of lines and stanzas which he has chosen to call sonnets, it is a fact that he had authority in other writers for each of the variations from usual forms which he employed, though not perhaps for giving them all the name sonnet. The poem in Poulter's Measure is an imitation of a similar poem by Sir Edward Dyer in the same metre,[2] and for each of the other forms in the list above he had a model in Sidney's *Arcadia*, if we except those in which a sonnet-form is combined with six-line stanzas, and in this case the poems are not to be regarded as units, but as two or three poems continuing the same theme, as, for example, in Sidney's *Wonders of England*, which consists of a series of ten-line poems in a sonnet-form bound together in one poem.

The twelve remaining poems are in metres more markedly lyrical than the sonnet-form, and are evidently meant to belong to the same

[1] In the former class belongs the irregular rhyming in the plays, and in the latter the rhyming of a form in -s with one without -s. For this not uncommon usage, compare Spenser's *Shepherds' Calendar* and Daniel's Works *passim*.

[2] These poems form a most interesting example of the custom of literary imitations, replies, or variations, common in several forms among poets of the time. Besides Dyer's *A Fancy* and Greville's poem, there is still a third in this series, namely Father Southwell's *Dyer's Fancy turned to a sinner's complaint*, printed with both of the other poems in Hannah's well-known volume, *The Courtly Poets*. The amiable controversy of Dr. Hannah and Dr. Grosart concerning the question of priority as between Greville and Dyer need not detain us; it matters little as to the merits of the poems, an imitator being to the Elizabethans as much of a creator as an original; and it is only necessary to say that my reasons for putting Dyer's first are simply that Poulter's Measure is much more characteristic of him than of Greville, and that Father Southwell on entering the tournament directs his challenge at Dyer, not Greville. See Grosart's ed. of Greville, Vol. II, Essay, pp. lxxi-lxxii; Hannah, *Courtly Poets*, 154-173.

class as the 'songs' of *Astrophel and Stella*. It is in these that Greville's technical faults are most noticeable, and in one or two of them it is hard even to determine the metrical rule by which they are made. They are as follows:

Sonnet 4: 2 stanzas, a b a b a b c c.
Sonnet 6: 4 stanzas, rhymed sapphics.
Sonnet 29: 6 stanzas, a a b c c b.
Sonnet 37: 12 stanzas, of the form $a_1a_2b_1b_2a_3$, all in limping dactyls.
Sonnet 45: 5 stanzas: a b a b c c d e e d.
Sonnet 52: 5 stanzas: a a b b c c.
Sonnet 56: 52 lines, seven-syllable trochaics, rhyming a b a b, plus a couplet at the end.
Sonnet 61: a b a b c d c d c e, five times.
Sonnet 74: 54 lines, seven- and eight-syllable trochaics, rhyming in couplets.
Sonnet 75: (probably corrupt). The form seems to be a a b b c c d d, the first four lines iambic, the last four trochaic. One stanza.
Sonnet 76: About 250 lines, seven- and eight-syllable trochaics rhyming in couplets. In the middle portion a regular alternation of seven- and eight-syllable couplets is observed, so as to give a stanza-effect, as throughout the Eighth Song of *Astrophel and Stella*.
Sonnet 83: 6 lines a a b b c c, apparently of trochaic intent.

The metrical characteristics of the cycle may now be considered as evidence concerning the history of its composition. The necessary facts for this purpose can be most clearly presented in the following table.

	Sonnets 1–18 (18 poems).	Sonnets 19–36 (18 poems).	Sonnets 37–54 (18 poems).	Sonnets 55–72 (18 poems).	Sonnets 73–90 (18 poems).	Sonnets 91–110 (17 poems).	Totals.
Poems in sonnet-form	10	15	13	6	7	5	56
Poems in stanzas.....	6	1	2	9	9	11	38
Poems formed of a combination of sonnets and stanzas	..	..	1	1	..	1	3
Number of 11-syl. lines *per cent.*	70	42	17	5	14	12	..
Ib., excluding poems wholly in 11-syl. or nearly so.....	47	35	17	5	5	4*	..
Number of poems wholly in 11-syl. lines or nearly so.....	7	1	0	0	2	3*	..

* See remarks following.

The twelve poems in song-metres and the one in Poulter's Measure are excluded, and the rest, 97 in number, are divided into groups of

16 or 17 each, as the most convenient way of representing certain changes which take place gradually in the course of the sequence. Under the first heading, poems in sonnet-form, are included all the variations of the proper sonnet, the ten-line, the eighteen-line, and so on.

The table shows that in some respects the metrical characteristics of the latter part of the sequence are different from those of the first part, and that the changes take place gradually throughout the sequence. In the first place the poems in sonnet-form steadily decrease in number and those in stanzas increase. The only exception to the regularity of this development is in the first section, Sonnets 1-18, in which the number of sonnets is smaller than in the second section and the number of poems in stanzas considerably greater. Of this exception something will be said presently.

In the second place, the number of eleven-syllable lines in the first part of the sequence is so great that such lines may be said to be the rule, but it gradually diminishes in the succeeding sections, until eleven-syllable lines become exceptional in the section including Sonnets 55-72. Thenceforward there is a slight increase in the number. But the increase is not generally distributed through the poems of these sections; it is due to five poems alone. Two of these, Nos. 85 and 87, are in sonnet-form; the other three, Nos. 99, 100, 110, are poems in six-line stanzas, which are included in the last division of the table, although the number of eleven-syllable lines in them is respectively only 10 in 18, 12 in 24, 14 in 30, for the reason that they are sufficiently hendecasyllabic to be in marked contrast with the other poems of this section, and that their metrical character is therefore especially significant. These three poems, it is to be noticed, are different from those in immediate connection with them in their poetic character and style as well as in metrical character. They are personal and lyrical, really hymns or prayers, and in contrast with the abstract philosophy of all the rest of the poems in the last part of the sequence.

How are we to construe these changes? They clearly indicate, to begin with, that the sequence was written during a considerable period of years, and not even approximately at one point in the author's career. This conclusion depends not so much on the fact that changes in metrical character occur, as on the fact that they are of the nature of a progression, indicating that Greville passed through several stages of metrical practice in the course of the writing of these poems.

But it is possible to come closer than this to the meaning of the facts. The figures in the table show that Greville, although he began writing in company with Sidney, chose a somewhat different form of the sonnet for common use from that which Sidney preferred; that is to say, he practised a mixture of ten- and eleven-syllable lines within

the same poem. He also wrote a number of poems wholly in eleven-syllable lines. In *Astrophel and Stella* there are not only no hendeca-syllabic sonnets, but there is not a single line, in a sonnet, of eleven syllables, and in the *Arcadia* there are but two sonnets containing such lines: one, a sonnet in the form used by Surrey, Greville, and Shake-speare, has eleven syllables in the second and fourth lines of each quatrain;[1] the other, in a pure Italian form, is wholly hendecasyl-labic.[2] Greville's practise therefore seems to be due to his own taste rather than to his models, and he uses the eleven-syllable, not as an imitation of the Italian, or as an experiment in form, but as a natural and habitual way of expression. In this respect he is singular among the sonnetteers.

What is meant then by the fact that from Sonnet 50 to Sonnet 80, roughly, eleven-syllable lines are exceptional? Naturally we think of the later period of sonnet-writing in the early 90's. The great sequences of that time, Drayton's, Spenser's, Shakespeare's, established the deca-syllabic line as part of the character of the sonnet. The attempts to adapt Italian forms, with the consequent use of eleven-syllable lines, in various lyrical metres, were less important, or at least were in the hands of less important men, than in the period of *Arcadia* and the earliest sonnets of *Caelica*. The years '85 to '95 are the period of the most formal use of the decasyllable, not only in the drama, but also in other forms not markedly lyrical.

On this point we are not dependent on internal evidence alone. Daniel, in his *Defence of Ryme* (1602) says:[3]

> Besides, to me this change of number in a Poem of one nature fits not so well, as to mixe uncertainly feminine Rymes with masculine, which, ever since I was warned of that deformitie by my kinde friend and countriman Maister Hugh Samford, I have alwayes so avoided it, as there are not above two couplettes in that Kind in all my Poem of the Civill warres: and I would willingly if I could, have altered it in all the rest, holding feminine Rymes to be fittest for Ditties, and either to be set certaine, or else by themselves.[4]

Now although this was not written until 1602, four books of Daniel's Poem of the Civill warres were printed in 1595, and the practice of distinguishing sharply between ten- and eleven-syllable lines of which he speaks began in his case therefore before or about that time. Now, after Sidney's death, Greville's most intimate association of a purely

---

[1] Bk. III, p. 375 (1633 ed.).

[2] Bk. IV, pp. 409-10.

[3] Hazlewood, *Ancient Critical Essays*, II., p. 218.

[4] *I.e.*, either throughout a poem, or else according to a regular rule of recurrence.

literary kind was with Daniel, and indeed his long continued familiarity with him was part of the inheritance of his friendship with Sidney. For Daniel was one of the poets to whom Wilton had been a poetical Elysium and the Countess of Pembroke a sympathetic benefactor, even in the days when Sidney had been the light of that circle. Of course the relation between Greville and Daniel was that of patron and poor poet; yet there is no reason of course why Greville should not follow the leading of his protégé in the art which was his peculiar possession. Moreover, Greville's name is associated directly with the work in which Daniel makes these remarks. Daniel says that this work is only an extension, for purposes of publication, of a letter which he had written about a year before to a courtier who is generally identified with Greville; and the author of the article in *Biographia Britannica* quoted from above had seen letters between the two in which Greville's judgment was commended by Daniel. Positive proof cannot of course be drawn from these facts for the date of the middle section of the *Sonnets* which we are considering; but they at least show influences to which we know that Greville was subject and which will account for his departure from the practice with which he began. I think it probable therefore that the greater number of the *Sonnets* between Nos. 40 and 84 were written in the post-Sidneyan period, or between 1586 and 1600.

Finally, in the last section, from about Sonnet 80 to the end, the same condition, infrequency of eleven-syllable lines, exists, and the percentage even decreases slightly if we leave out of the count five poems in which the hendecasyllabic idea prevails. Greville has therefore arrived at the exact kind of practice in this respect which Daniel describes. He now uses eleven-syllable lines again, but he 'sets them certain or by themselves,' and shows, besides, a clear intention to associate them with poems of lyrical effect, thus approximating at least the limitation of lines of this kind to "ditties," which Daniel advocates. But at this point we must turn to Greville's dramas, in which we find a change in metrical usage exactly parallel to that which takes place in the latter parts of the sonnet sequence.

The chronological relation of *Alaham* and *Mustapha* will be considered in a following chapter; but in the meantime the opinion of Mr. Gosse that *Alaham* is the earlier may be accepted. Now in *Alaham* there are only exceptional cases of the eleven-syllable line; in Act I there are none, in Act II, 4, and so throughout. But in *Mustapha* there are many such lines, and even in passages prevailingly decasyllabic the eleven-syllable lines are in general about ten per cent. of the whole number. But the point especially to be noted is that it contains passages wholly or largely in eleven-syllable lines. For example, V, 1

(17 lines) is wholly hendecasyllabic; II, 1 contains 83 lines, and of the first 25 all but 5 are of eleven syllables, of the following 39 but 3, of the last 19, 12. Here then is enough evidence to show that Greville was in general following the rule with regard to feminine rhymes that they should be "set certain," while his departures from that rule in the use of them here and there are in keeping with the freedom he allowed himself throughout his work in the application of formal restrictions. Again, it is evident that Greville is here using the eleven-syllable line in certain passages because he believes that it conduces to an emotional effect; the passages in which it is used are either those in which the good characters of his play, Camena and Achmat, express with lyrical emotion their feelings about the evil world around them, or those in which the incidents of the catastrophe are related.

In the difference, then, between *Alaham* and *Mustapha* we have exactly the development in metrical practice which appears in the second half of *Caelica*. Reasons will be given later for believing that *Mustapha* was written after 1603. The metrical evidence, therefore, is such as to indicate that the last part of *Caelica* was written later than the other parts and probably after 1600.

To this argument from the verse must be added the more intangible but equally convincing evidence of style and thought. The consecutive and repeated reading of the *Sonnets* confirms beyond all doubt the opinion of Prof. Schelling: "*Caelica* exhibits very decidedly . . . a deepening maturity of mind, and may have been written through a series of years,"[1] and the changes in this respect are such, as I hope to show in the following paragraphs, that, like the changes in the verse, they could only have taken place through a long period. In the last section particularly, from 85 to the end, not only the depth of thought, but the subjects treated and the opinions expressed concerning them indicate the exact latitude and longitude—to take a figure favored by Greville himself—in which he was sailing when he wrote certain of the *Treatises*. Finally, there are two minor pieces of exact evidence: the 52d Sonnet appeared in John Dowland's *First Book of Songs or Airs*, 1597;[2] and the 82d Sonnet is in praise of Elizabeth. If the sonnets are in about the order in which they were written, as seems to be the case, these poems indicate that the middle group was written in Elizabeth's reign.

It is probable, then, that about the first 40 sonnets were written before 1586; that the following up to about 84 were written after 1586, but before 1600; and that all or most of the remaining sonnets, 85 to 110, were written after 1600.

[1] *Elizabethan Lyrics*, as before, p. 220.

[2] A. H. Bullen's ed. *England's Helicon*, p. xxvi.

II

The history of Greville's literary activity, which ends in the time of Buckingham and Laud, begins in a period which seems to be removed from that time by even more than the actual fifty years between them—in the time of his familiar exercise with Philip Sidney. The two friends, who were bound to each other by closer ties than those which attached Edward Dyer to the group, were associated in all the active pursuits of the chivalry of the age, travel, diplomacy, social observances, jousting, pageantry, and plans of 'Indian' adventure. But their practice of knight-errantry derives an especial charm, which distinguishes them and their circle among the courtiers of Elizabeth, from the fact that it included all the intellectual accomplishments of the time. All that was best in the learning of England gravitated toward Sidney and came within Greville's orbit. Castelnau de Mauvissière, the French philosopher-statesman, found congenial company in their circle.[1] They were the most intelligent and courteous auditors of Bruno's speculative improvisations.[2] And Sidney showed his approval of the anti-Aristotelian doctrines which emanated from both of these sources by appointing William Temple,[3] the translator and exponent of the philosophy of Ramus, his private secretary. Spenser was also of the circle,[4] and with him they must have discussed and approved the Platonic doctrines so much affected in all the more enlightened

[1] Michaud, *dict. de la Biog. Univ., s. n.*

[2] Bruno's *Cena de le ceneri*, (*Le opere italiane*, &c., Gottingen, 1888) pp. 180, -1, and passim; also his *Epistola Esplicatoria* to the *Spaccio de la Bestia trionfante*, addressed to Sidney. A tradition has grown up of an 'Academy' consisting of all the men mentioned in the above paragraph, in imitation of Italian institutions. The ultimate source of it is the *Cena de le ceneri* of Bruno, and the immediate the following note by Joseph Warton on an allusion to Sidney in Pope's *Essay on Man:* "Among many things related of the life and character of this all-accomplished person, it does not seem to have been much known that he was the intimate friend and patron of the famous atheist Giordano Bruno, who was in a secret club with him and Sir Fulke Greville, held in London in 1587 [sic]." Quoted by Zouch, *Life of Sidney*, N. Y., 1808, p. 337. This "club" is spoken of by Berti in his well-known work on Bruno, by Beyersdorff in his learned monograph on Bruno and Shakespeare, and even by Mr. Fox Bourne in his revised *Life of Sidney* (Heroes of the Nations series), and has developed by elaborations into a complete 'Academy.' But I can find no evidence for it except the account by Bruno of the meeting at Greville's house, and that is not such as to indicate the existence of a society. (Since this note was written an article on *Giordano Bruno in England* has appeared in the Quarterly Review (no. 392, Oct. 1902), the author of which exposes the tradition and carries it back to the same source in Joseph Warton's note.)

[3] *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*

[4] See passage quoted, p. 2, from *Two Other verie commendable Letters.*

s, in fact, a member of the only society
ıpared in intellectual culture with the
ıies of France and Italy; and, in view
ich he maintained in his mature years
›f the Renaissance, there is a particular
s the associate in his early manhood of
rs.

ɔy to know all of the new Elizabethan
was distinctly popular, at its sources.
lose communication with their univer-
se-writing and play-writing which were
here the young Countess of Pembroke
gave stimulus to literary pursuit, for
r classical models; and here Greville
rly days, the poet Samuel Daniel, who
ıg. He may have heard parts of *The*
or at court in 1589. But in his asso-
reville came most directly under the
ew literature, its classicism, its Ital-
imental imitation in which it began.
ıg. They explain, for one thing, the
all, at which some persons have won-
e adopted, the sonnet and the Senecan
ns. But he used these literary forms,
m in their own kinds, but as means
s of his own; and the points in which
odels are even more interesting than
tedness to them.

distinguished as the first group are
ate influence of Sidney, and in their
ry character, they show this influence.
ual associates that gathered about him,
onic mode of thought. In *Astrophel*
revailing idea is the contrast between
ch appeal to the soul alone and the
ıry human desire is fixed. Sidney,
as a literary or decorative convention
life, and in *Astrophel and Stella* he
ificial restraint it lays upon nature.[2]

, Vol. I, pp. xxx-xxxii.

ınd S., 5, 21, 25, 71, 72 and two sonnets
ks (Pollard's ed. *A. and S.*, pp. 173, 174.)

Greville expounds this Platonic thought in a number of earlier sonnets, and he is more faithful than Sidney to its absolute distinctions. Sometimes he pays homage to a certain lady in whom the spiritual ideals are supposed to be realized, as in Sonnet 3.

> More than most faire, full of that heavenly fire
> Kindled above to show the Maker's glory,
> . . . . . .
> Thou window of the skie, and pride of spirits,
> True character of Honour in perfection,
> Thou heavenly creature, judge of earthly merits,
> And plorious prison of man's pure affection
> If in my heart all nymphs else be defaced
> Honour the shrine, where you alone are placed.[1]

But this and two or three other sonnets in the same strain are almost certainly addressed to Queen Elizabeth, and not to the poet's mistress, and when he writes of ordinary love Greville's natural pessimism expresses itself in the form of an absolute contrast between the ideal and the actual. He will not admit that virtue and beauty can keep their likeness in earthly forms. Thus, in Sonnet 10, he addresses Love:

> Rather goe backe unto that heavenly quire
> Of Nature's riches, in her beauties placed,
> And there in contemplation feed desire,
> Which till it wonder, is not rightly graced;
> For those sweet glories, which you doe aspire,
> Must, as idea's, only be embraced,
> Since excellence in other forme enioyed,
> Is by descending to her saints destroyed.

Whether couched in the language of Platonism or not, this is Greville's ordinary attitude. The sonnets in which he speaks the language of natural passion are very few, and the far commoner mood is that in which he renounces earthly love and Caelica together. It is indeed a fair question whether *Caelica* is a cycle of love or of anti-love.

The literary qualities of the sonnets of this early period are such as would be expected in poems written in an experimental period and in close imitation of the work of another. They may be described as fol-

---

[1] The first two lines are almost identical with the first two of Spenser's 8th Sonnet:

> More than most faire, full of the living fire
> Kindled above unto the Maker neere.

Compare the description of the birth of Love in Spenser's *An Hymne in Honour of Love*, 11, 64-5:

> And taking to him wings of his owne heate
> Kindled at first from heavens life-giving fyre.

lows: first, frequent classical allusion, especially in the form of fancies concerning Cupid and his attributes; secondly, poverty of subjects, shown in numerous variations of the same devices; thirdly, artificiality, the larger number of the poems being in the class of exercises on the set themes of sonnetteers; fourthly, the occurrence of a number of poems written apparently in direct competition with Sidney, and hence partly fulfilling the conditions of the "tournament-sonnet."

With these early sonnets are certainly to be placed all of the poems in seven- and eight-syllable lines which occur later in the sequence and most of the other poems in 'song'-measures. All of these are experimental and in imitation of Sidney. On the other hand it seems likely that among the first ten sonnets are some which were either added to the sequence at a later time or were substituted for earlier poems which originally held their places. It is not probable, for example, that Sonnets 3 and 7 were written by so inexperienced a hand as most of those from 11 to 40.

In the poems of this first section Greville for the only time attempted the lighter steps of fancy; and the result confirms in substance his own criticism, that his was a "creeping genius." The effect of their fanciful decoration, especially when used, as it often is, to give point to harsh and cynical thought, is not only unpleasing, but displeasing, as the failures of a serious temperament in this kind of effort usually are. It is true that there are some sonnets here which are exceptions to the rule. Sonnet 3, "More than most faire, full of that heavenly fire;" Sonnet 7, "The world, that all containes is euer mouing;" Sonnet 17, "Cynthia, whose glories are at fulle for euer;" and finally Sonnet 22, "I, with whose colors Myra drest her head," which is Greville's simplest and most feeling love-poem and contains his finest line: all of these are poems worthy of a place in the Elizabethan anthology. Two of them, however, are probably not chronologically placed, namely, 3 and 17, which seem to be addressed to Elizabeth, and very likely a third.[1] In the one or two others in which there is something of his better quality he has met success by escaping from the literary fashion which he was vainly attempting to follow, and for the artificial devices which make up the bulk of this part the criticism that they are "harsh fantastic echoes" of Sidney[2] is not too severe.

Gradually, however, a change appears. In the metrical exercises of the first group Greville worked out to some extent his technical

[1] See the preceding paragraph.

[2] Mrs. Mary A. Ward, Introd. to selections from Greville in Mr. T. H. Ward's *The English Poets*, Vol. I.

freedom, and the poems beginning with Sonnet 40 first show clearly his characteristic quality. His obscurity has become greater rather than less; for it is now increased by the darkness of close and mysterious thought. Both the allegorical devices and the displeasing satire of the first group are noticeably absent, and instead of Platonism there is the ordinary contrast between truth and right on the one side and the world on the other. The religious emotion, on the other hand, which inspires the eloquence of the later sonnets, is not expressed anywhere in this group. We read of Reason and Nature's wisdom, but there is no distinct religious expression, though the themes give opportunity for the expression of such ideas. The thought rests on the bitterness of experience and the absurdities and contradictions of life.

The literary characteristics of this group, which for the sake of convenience we limit definitely by the 40th and 84th Sonnets, are as distinct as the characteristics of its thought. First, classical allusion is infrequent, and when it appears it is not used for the sake of ornament. In 62, for example, Cupid, Mars, and Mercury are mentioned, but without their attributes and as mere names for love, war, and learning. In the first ten sonnets of this section there are four containing classical allusion; in the other thirty-five but three.

Secondly, the images used for illustration are of a noteworthy kind. The greater number are drawn from real life and almost all of them from its homely conditions. Thus in 43 it is the man who suffers from gossiping neighbors, and again the child that suffers from the nurse's tyranny. If these are somewhat grotesque—as befits their partly ironical intent—the same realistic method is turned to better advantage in 61, in which the child and its nurse (a favorite image of Greville's), the rower, the looking-glass, and the boy leaving his home to go into the world, are used for illustration. Another class of images are those drawn from the natural sciences and other branches of learning, almost exclusively, however, from those which are practical and closely related to common life. It is notable that Greville never—or rarely—resorts to speculative inquiry, pseudo-science, or superstitious lore, as Donne and Sir Thomas Browne, for example, are wont to do, but is rather distinguished by the accuracy and plainness of his illustrations. Sonnet 63 affords a number of examples of these images from familiar learning: 1, the fact that those who sail around the world return in the same direction in which they set out, an illustration used by Donne with an added subtlety in his *A Hymn to God, My God, in my Sickness;* 2, the similarity in the complexion of those who live in the Tropics and in the Arctic Circle; 3, the rising of the moisture and fire of earth to the elements in which they are born, and the changes of form they endure in arriving at the goal of their desires, an exception perhaps

to the general character of these illustrations described above; 4, the compass and the load-stone. In 61, again, we have in lines 50-54 the rising of the sap in trees; in 77 the dying man and his doctor; in 78, the parallels of latitude and longitude, henceforth a commonplace in Greville's works; in 79, the atoms which can "neither rest nor stand nor can erect," straws that move toward "ieat," glow-worms shining by night. Some of these illustrations show more than usual curiosity in the natural sciences, and one cannot but recall the fact, in reading them, that Greville was a fellow-resident of Essex House from 1594 to the day of Essex' arrest with Francis Bacon, whose *Advancement of Learning* he partly echoed and partly controverted in his own *Treatise of Humane Learning*. The common characteristic of all the images of this group, from whatever source they are drawn, is their plainness and their remarkable definiteness, and the effect they are meant to produce is that of the closest possible adherence to reality. In avoiding all that might seem literary ornament, he makes his images correspond to the exact truth of observation and applies them with ingenious exactness to the truths they illustrate. We should not need to go outside of the *Sonnets* we are considering for additional examples, but the most remarkable case of the quality in question is in one of the Treatises, in which he refers to the pacific attitude of the Catholic powers toward England at the time when he was writing:

> Lie not France, Italy, Poland, Spain
> Still as the snow doth when it threatens more.[1]

Again in the *Chorus Quartus* of *Alaham*, alluding to a phenomenon well-known to navigators:

> Like as strong windes doe worke upon the sea,
> Stirring and tossing waues to warre each other:
> So princes doe with people's humors play,
> As if Confusion were the septer's mother.
> But crownes! take heed; when humble things mount high
> The windes oft calme before the billows lie.

Thirdly, notwithstanding the obscurity of Greville's writing, of which all his critics speak with feeling, his vocabulary is distinguished by its simplicity and definiteness. He calls things by their commonest names and renounces the ornaments of language. The emotional power of bare unadorned words in expressing intense convictions and deep feeling is one of the secrets of his impressiveness, and, like the plainness of his images, his use of such diction is a sign of his effort for incisiveness and expressiveness, rather than for decorative beauty. It

[1] *A Treatise of Monarchy*, st. 214 (*Of Church*).

has the effect of keeping his abstract truths close to the emotions of life, of keeping them alive with the life of the experience in which they were born. The famous line from the 22d Sonnet, in which the poet recalls the past favors of the inconstant Myra, owes something of its beauty to the eloquence and intensity of common words:

> Was it for this that I might Myra see
> Washing the water with her beauties white?

—though there is something besides in the power of the second line that defies analysis. Plainness of diction sometimes becomes mere baldness, when the thought is not high enough to ennoble it, and there are many prosaic lines and couplets in the sonnets; but on the other hand it may be both the sign and the source of power, as some of the following lines will show:

> When all this all doth passe from age to age.[1]

> Glory growes dark, the sonne becomes a night
> And makes this great world feele a greater might.[2]

> Then Caelica lose not heart-eloquence,
> Love understands not "come again."[3]

> Life is a top which whipping Sorrow driueth.[4]

Or again, of the strangeness of love in a world in which there is nothing but varied unhappiness:

> Love shall become the very love of sorrow.[5]

Or the following stanza, which in depth and subtlety surpasses all but the greatest Elizabethan sonnets:

> But when this life is from the body fled
> To see it selfe in that eternall glasse
> Where Time doth end, and thoughts accuse the dead,
> Where all to come is one with all that was;
> Then liuing men aske how he left his breath,
> That while he liue'd neuer thought of death.[6]

This quality is not peculiar to the part of Greville's work which we are now considering; we find an excellent illustration of it, for example, in a line from the *Treatise of Warres*,[7] on the vicissitudes of fortune under God's justice:

> He makes corn grow where Troy itself once stood.

---

[1] Sonnet 69. [2] Ib. [3] Sonnet 61.
[4] Sonnet 87. [5] Sonnet 9. [6] Sonnet 88.
[7] Stanza 34.

But it is more noticeable in this middle group than in the first, and in the later sonnets and the Treatises it is somewhat obscured by the vocabulary of learning, though even in these the use of uncommon words is limited to what the technical character of the subject demands.

Fourthly, the phrasing, to borrow a word from the technique of music, is noticeably short. Thought is completed as far as possible in periods of one or two lines. The style is broken and sententious; and there is no effort at continuousness or flow either of syntax or of metre.

These characteristics of the poems in which Greville first showed his true genius are interesting to students of Elizabethan literature. They show, first, that he wrote in a different manner when he was under Sidney's influence and when he followed his own bent; and in the second place they are traits different from those of the poets most admired by the cultivated readers of the nineties. Absence of decorative device, especially of classical allusion, plainness of diction, and the use of homely unornamental images, in the decade of the *Faerie Queene* and the love-sequences, are marks of a departure from prevailing literary styles. Greville himself was aware that he was a different kind of poet from Sidney and many of his later contemporaries, and he explained wherein, as it seemed to him, the difference lay. In his *Life of Sidney*, after praising the dexterity of his friend, "even with the dashes of his pen to make the Arcadian antiques beautifie the margents of his works," he continues:

> For my own part, I found my creeping Genius more fixed upon the Images of Life, than the Images of Wit, and therefore chose not to write to them on whose foot the black Oxe had not already trod, as the Proverbe is, but to those only, that are weather-beaten in the Sea of this World, such as having lost the sight of their Gardens, and groves, study to saile on a right course among Rocks and quick-sands.[1]

As regards the literary theory involved in this profession it seems indeed to have little to distinguish it from much familiar criticism of the time. When Mrs. Ward says of it that it "breathes the spirit of a new world; and in parting Lord Brooke from the writer of *Astrophel and Stella* places him mentally beside Milton and Bacon,"[2] she is thinking of the gravity of its tone and its deep humanitarian feeling, of the distinction in thought and spirit which we have said separates Greville from what is characteristic in the Elizabethan time; and certainly the accent of the passage makes it a different thing from the

[1] *Life of Sidney*, Grosart ed., IV, pp. 222-3; ed. 1652, 245-6.
[2] Mr. T. H. Ward's *The English Poets*, I, p. 367.

parallels to it which might be cited from Elizabethan critics. But the æsthetic theory which it suggests is only the imperfect rule of moral or utilitarian dependency which is found in most critics of Greville's time and is still effectively alive. It is superficially like the criticism which rested the claims of Homer and Hesiod upon the fact that they were teachers of divinity and the useful arts. As such it has left its traces in the unpoetic character of much that Greville wrote in verse. But taken in its context and in connection with Greville's actual practice it has also a more definite meaning. He has been speaking of the pastoral and classical images with which Sidney's works are adorned, and of their literary decoration in general, and to indicate the contrast between his own work and Sidney's he says that his genius is not adapted to the fanciful ornaments of poetry, or, as he calls them, the "images of wit," but rather is fixed upon the "images of life," the commonplace reality of experience. We have seen how true to this modest profession Greville shows himself in the *Sonnets* of the group which we are considering. Even to renounce classical allusion, pastoral device, and decorative imagery is a sign of originality in a courtly poet of the nineties. But the distinction goes deeper than the mere garb of poetry and involves a difference in artistic aims and methods.

In his *Defence of Poesy* Sidney described with remarkable breadth the universal laws of the fine arts, but he also showed the influence of the peculiar spirit of his time. The following passages illustrate both of these characteristics:

> There is no Arte deliuered to mankinde, that hath not the workes of Nature for his principall obiect, without which they could not consist, and on which they so depend, as they become Actors and Players as it were, of what Nature will haue set foorth . . .; only the Poet, disdayning to be tied to any such subiection, lifted vp with the vigor of his owne inuention, dooth growe in effect, another Nature, in makeing things either better than Nature bringeth forth, or quite a newe formes such as neuer were in nature: . . . he goeth hand in hand with Nature, not inclosed within the narrow warrant of her guifts, but freely ranging only within the Zodiack of his owne wit. Nature neuer set forth the earth in so rich tapistry, as diuers Poets haue done, neither with plesant riuers, fruitful trees, sweet smelling flowers: nor whatsoeuer els may make the too much loued earth more louely. Her world is brasen, the Poets only deliuer a golden.[1]

That nature's "world is brasen, the Poets only deliuer a golden" is in a certain sense true whatever the kind of poetry, whoever the poets; but it is particularly true of the poets of quick fancy and free invention who create a new world clearly and intentionally finer than

[1] *An Apologie for Poetrie*, ed. Arber, p. 24; *The Defence of Poesy*, pp. 67-9, *Misc. Works of Sidney*, Boston, 1860.

nature ever set forth, whose method of illustrating life is the idealist's, and not the realist's. It describes what was more or less consciously regarded as the function of literature by all the more cultivated writers of the time. It is the idealized expression of the spirit which animated the sonnetteers in creating their "golden worlds" of love, and guided the pens of the romancers, the pastoralists, and the author of the *Faerie Queene*. Even the affectation of make-believe languages, as in Euphuism and Arcadianism, and the conventional nature pieced up from the bestiary and other fabulous science are signs of a tendency in the art of the time to avoid the contacts of vulgar reality. It is not true of course that this literature is divorced from life; "there is no Arte deliuered to mankinde, that hath not the workes of Nature for his principall obiect." But its method of illustrating life was to create another world corresponding to the actual world and illuminating it at many points, yet not the same and not even like it. Greville's method, on the contrary, is to illustrate life by life. His object is not to gild reality, but to reproduce the very color and touch of its brass. He desires above all that his readers shall know his abstractions actually true to experience, and by plainness of diction, omission of ornament, and illustrations from real observation, he guards against the suspicion that his is a mere imaginary world of poetry. With noteworthy independence, which attaches our interest and fully justifies it, he seeks what there may be to engage the mind and please the imagination, in short the charm of poetry, in the objects closest at hand.

Greville himself, it is true, was not conscious that his departure from the poets of his circle had a literary significance. In his own mind it was their moral, and not their literary, character that distinguished his poems from those of his associates. He felt that his temperament was too serious, his mind too "weather-beaten in the Sea of this World" for the joyous freedom in which their infancy dilated, that he had to pick his steps more carefully along the hard path of experience because he could not see the aim of the journey so clearly. This was his explanation of the character of his poetry, and he was unquestionably right in attributing it to the peculiarity of his own temperament. It was a trait of his mind, as we see in his letters,[1] to dwell habitually on the falseness of motives and ideals which passed current in the world for good and even for best, and his tendency toward gloomy reflection may well have been encouraged by his physical frailty,

[1] The reference is to the many private letters of Greville's printed in the Reports of the Historical MSS. Commission (the Coke MSS.) and not used by any of the biographers of Greville. They are principally letters of John Coke, Greville's secretary, afterward Sir John Coke, Secretary of State; some of the more interesting will be quoted from in the following pages.

which through long periods was actual ill-health. Sir Robert Naunton, indeed, who knew him well, said that his physical weakness was due to the over-activity of his mind; he wrote to a friend that Greville's health was distempered "by the restless working of his own thoughts."[1]

But the fact that his literary departure was unconscious does not alter its significance. In view of such achievements as Sonnets 61, 69, 87, 88, for example, it is evident that he had more of the poet's peculiar gift than he cared to claim for himself; and that in setting himself a more serious aim, as he supposed, than the poet's he took the very means of attaining an original literary effect. By trying to make his words tally exactly with actual experience he succeeded in giving to single lines and sometimes to longer passages, in absolutely simple words, a peculiar power which is unlike anything in the poets with whom he was personally associated. It is different in kind rather than degree from the fanciful eloquence of Sidney, the flowing and ornamented style of Spenser, and the intellectual grace of Daniel. The best parallel to the effect of these lines is to be found in the works of John Donne, a poet who, with a much clearer consciousness of what he was doing, departed, as Greville did, from the prevailing Elizabethan modes. There is much to justify a comparison between these two poets. Like Greville, Donne renounced classical allusion for the sake of ornament, and showed a liking for realistic and scientific images; and this in the decade of the *Faerie Queene*. They were both actuated by the desire to say more incisive and significant things than the conventional sonnetteers and the diffuse Spenserians; and they are distinguished among their contemporaries by extraordinary richness and subtlety of thought. And finally at their best they both illustrate the boundless power of poetic suggestion in a bare as distinguished from an ornamented diction.

In discussing the general characteristics of Greville's work we have passed somewhat beyond the scope of the chronological plan we have been following. There is a third group of the sonnets, distinguishable by traits of metre, style and subject-matter. This consists of the sonnets beginning with 85 and including all the following to the end of the sequence, which were written, as seems probable, after 1600, and some of them considerably after that date. The most striking peculiarity of this part of *Caelica* is that it has no mention of the lady to whom the earlier poems are addressed, or even of the subject of love in any form. Eighty-five is a formal farewell to Cupid,

Farewell, sweet boy, complaine not of my truth;

[1] Twelfth Report Hist. MSS. Com., App., Part I, p. 68.

in 86 the poet takes the vows of the higher, spiritual love, in language much like that of his early Platonism,

> Love is the peace, whereto all thoughts do striue;

and thenceforth he writes on political, moral, and religious themes alone. The thought in these poems is closely parallel to that of the Treatises and the choruses of the plays, and the common metrical form is the six-line stanza; it is probable, therefore, that some of them are chips thrown off in the shaping of the longer works. But there are also some poems in this group, particularly Sonnets 98, 99, 100, 110, of a freer and more lyrical character, which add something to our estimate of Greville's poetic range. They are distinguished in their subjects and the mental attitude they reveal from the earlier sonnets, for while he appeared in those as the poet of experience these give him a title to a place among the religious poets of the Jacobean period. Their tone is sombre and admonitory as in all of Greville's writings, but open invective and prophecy take the place of the covert irony of 69 and 77, for example; and it is not now the power of evil in the world that excites the poet's indignation, but the hypocrisy and corruption of those who assume to be the chosen seed of Israel,

> That sensuall, vnsatiable vaste wombe
> Of the seen church.

In their denunciation of the sins of the priesthood they illustrate the meaning of the misunderstood *Chorus Quintus* of *Mustapha,* in which by the dramatic method he was following Greville was prevented from giving expression to the deep religious feeling, truly Puritan in its inwardness and its intimate personal character, which was the source of his antagonism to the church. The 'church,' it should be noted, means here not only the church of Rome. Passages of unquestionable definiteness in the Treatises show that Puritanism, Romanism, and Anglicanism fell, as such, under the same condemnation in Greville's mind. Religion, he believed, was purely an aspiration of the individual souls of the elect, and could not be expressed in an institution. This conviction is surely not that of Greville's youth. It belongs to the latest period of his thought, and it marks the difference which separates Greville, when his whole work is considered, from Sidney and Sidney's age, and gives him affinities with the more distressed and spiritually self-conscious age when Puritanism was dominant.

The literary characteristics of these poems are not less interesting. In the first place, they are the least obscure of Greville's poems, and in fact offer no unusual difficulties. Again, the diction is elevated

where in the former poems it was plain; the figures are lofty and rhetorical, rather than homely and ironical; and whereas the phrasing before was noticeably short, there is now an attempt, sometimes successful, at long and sonorous periods. Thought, syntax, and metre flow forward with a steady and even stately movement. In 99, 100, and 110 these characteristics are particularly emphasized, these poems being, under the name of sonnets, actually hymns in the form of prayers, each with a refrain at the end of the stanza. One would like to find traces of literary influence in this later group of religious lyrics; and in form and phrase there are possibly signs of the wonderfully diffused influence of the "divine" songs of Donne. In some respects they are quite different from anything of Donne's, and there is no distinct evidence of either literary or personal relations between the two poets; but in the last stanza of Sonnet 99, for example, and particularly in the fourth line, there is something that suggests the master who most influenced Jacobean and Caroline poetry:

> If from this depth of sinne, this hellish graue,
> And fatall absence from my Sauiour's glory,
> I could implore His mercy Who can saue,
> And for my sinnes, not paines of sinne, be sorry:
> Lord from this horror of iniquity,
> And hellish graue, Thou wouldst deliuer me.

II

THE DRAMAS

Though the Senecan drama of the Elizabethan period has not been clearly enough distinguished in the general histories of the drama, by Collier, Fleay, and Ward, its characteristics have been described in several recent monographs, and it will not be necessary to repeat here what is already well known through these works.[1] The cult of this form, however, in the time of Greville's activity in it has not been satisfactorily discussed in any work which has yet appeared, and it demands a word of notice by way of introduction to Greville's plays.

Greville had every reason to be interested in the Senecan drama. At Cambridge, both during his residence there and in the following years, during which he was in frequent communication with his university, many plays of this form in Latin were produced, and it was especially popular at Trinity College, which he continually aided both by his money and his influence at court. Oxford, Sidney's university, and Sidney himself were also interested in it. We do not know whether Greville was with Sidney when Dr. Gage's *Meleager* was played at Christ Church College in 1584, in the presence of Leicester, Pembroke, and their young kinsman, but we may guess, with the help of the *Defence of Poesy*, what kind of comparisons he heard Sidney draw between the artlessness of the early popular plays and the scholarly refinement of *Gorboduc*. Again, at the Inns of Court, where he must have had many acquaintances in the years of his plain Mastership, the Senecan form was the form of predilection. Greville's friend, Francis Bacon, it will be remembered, took a part in the production of the *Misfortunes of Arthur* before the Queen in 1587-8. Robert Wilmot, of the Inner Temple, was another promoter of the Senecan idea, and

[1] The two most important are: Cunliffe, *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy*, London, 1893, and Rudolf Fischer, *Zur Kunstentwicklung der englischen Tragödie*, Strassburg, 1893. Compare also a note by Prof. Saintsbury in Grosart's editon of Daniel, III, pp. vii to xi, though Prof. Saintsbury was not aware of all the exemplars of the later Senecan flourishing, of which he was particularly writing; and Prof. Herford's *Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century, passim.*

I have also had the benefit of a Harvard dissertation by Dr. J. A. Lester on *Connections between the Drama of France and Great Britain, particularly in the Elizabethan period*, which has not yet been printed, and I gladly acknowledge my indebtedness both to Dr. Lester and to Dr. W. A. Neilson, of Harvard University, who has sent me an abstract of the part of the thesis which concerns Greville.

we mention him particularly because in the address to the "Gentlemen Students of the Inner Temple" which he prefixed to his *Tancred and Gismunda* (1591), he gives a better illustration of the motives which led to the cultivation of the classical drama than can be found elsewhere. The models, he says, from which he drew his license as a playwright were Beza's *Abraham* and Buchanan's *Jephtha*, and he conjures his Gismund not to "straggle in her plumes abroad, but to contain herself within the walls of your house; so am I sure she shall be safe from the tragedian tyrants of our time," that is to say, from the popular dramatists and actors.[1]

But the popularity of the Senecan drama at court and in the lawyers' houses declined after the full development of the native institution, and the responsibility for the later continuance of the genus in its strict classical form seems to rest largely upon one person. It was no less a person than Mary Sidney who drew a new tributary to feed the rivulet, and the source from which it came is most interesting in its suggestion of what might have happened to the English stage. In 1590 she wrote, and in 1592 printed, a translation of the *Marc Antoine* of Robert Garnier, one of the founders of the French classical drama.[2] Probably on account of the "popularity of *Antonie* in select circles," Kyd translated another of Garnier's plays, his *Cornelie*, in 1590-2 (published 1594),[3] and all of the plays in exact imitation of the Senecan form that followed were directly or indirectly due to the impulse given by the Countess of Pembroke's work. The full list of them is as follows:

		Published
The Countess of Pembroke.....	ANTONIE	1592
Thomas Kyd.....	CORNELIA	1594
Samuel Daniel.....	CLEOPATRA[4]	1594
	PHILOTAS[4]	1605
Samuel Brandon.....	VIRTUOUS OCTAVIA[5]	1598
Sir William Alexander.....	DARIUS	1603
	CRŒSUS	1604
	THE ALEXANDRÆAN	1605
	JULIUS CÆSAR[6]	1607

[1] Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, VII, p. 15.

[2] The Countess of Pembroke's *Antonie*, ed. with introduction by Alice Luce, Weimar, 1897.

[3] See Sarrazin, *Kyd und sein Kreis*, Berlin, 1892, p. 49; Kyd's *Cornelia* is printed in Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, V, and also edited by H. Gassner in *Jahresbericht der Luitpold-realschule*, 1894, and in Mr. Boas' ed. of Kyd, 1902.

[4] Grosart's ed. of Daniel, Vol. III.

[5] See Collier's *Hist. of Dram. Poetry*, first edition, III, pp. 259-60.

[6] *Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander*, 3 vols., Glasgow, 1872. He called his plays 'Monarchic Tragedies.'

		Publis
Sir Fulke Greville.....	MUSTAPHA	16
	ALAHAM [1]	16

Most of the plays of this group are distinguished by certain co mon traits from the early Senecan plays. These traits are: (1) reg larity in verse-form, and in Daniel's *Cleopatra,* Brandon's *Octavia* a Alexander's Monarchic Tragedies, the regular use of abab rhymin (2) the use of elaborate stanza-forms, with a complicated rhyn scheme, in the Choruses, characteristic of all except three of the gro of which we will speak in a moment. These traits are the plain external marks of the French form of the Senecan drama, serving distinguish it from the earlier English form. The Countess of Pe broke used blank verse, with rhyme only in stychomythy, and at t ends of scenes, and rarely under other conditions. Kyd (except in o scene) used blank verse, with occasional rhymed couplets—these rhym couplets being introduced, apparently with an intentional approxim tion to regularity, at intervals of from 12 to 16 lines. But the alterna rhyming (abab) used by Daniel in *Cleopatra,* and perhaps imitated him from *Tancred and Gismunda,* was followed by the later write Brandon and Alexander.

Three of the plays of the group, however, do not have these ch acteristics, namely, Daniel's *Philotas* and the two plays of Grevill First, their verse-form is peculiar and different from that of any oth English plays. Lines rhymed alternately, lines rhyming in couple and unrhymed lines are mixed together in such a way that none of t three becomes the fixed form of a passage. Often the alternate rhyn and the rhyme in couplets are arranged so as to suggest, without pe fectly conforming to, the familiar six-line stanza, or sometimes succession of such stanzas. Daniel is particularly fond of this arrang ment and in fact has scenes which are almost regular in the six-li stanza; while Greville often is fairly regular in the alternation of couplet and a single unrhymed line, thus: a a b c c d e e f, etc. T following analysis of passages in Greville will make the descriptio clearer, the crosses representing unrhymed lines.

Alaham, III, 1:
+ + aa + + bbcdcdee + + ffgg + hh + + + (first 26 lines)
Mustapha, I, 2:
abab + + ccd + d + ee + ff + gg + hh + ii + jj + kk + ll (first lines)
Mustapha, V, 3, speech of Achmat (p. 407, Gros. ed.):
+ aa + bbcdcddeefgfghhi + i + + + (first 25 lines)

[1] The date of publication is not an indication here of the time of writing.

lle occasionally introduces an elaborate metrical device in *Mus-*
, as in II, 3, where twelve lines are rhymed on two sounds.
iomythy is always in rhyme. It should be added that Daniel is
regular than Greville and practices the mixture of blank-verse
ges with rhymed passages more than the mixture of the two forms
e same passage; but the ruling idea seems to be the same in both
, namely to relieve the monotony of rhyme both by avoiding regu-
r of arrangement and by interspersing unrhymed lines. The
wing passage from Daniel's *Defence of Ryme* seems to show that
s case at least this was the motive:

> must confesse, that to mine owne eare, those continuall cadences of
> ts used in long and continued Poems, are very tyresome, & unpleasing,
> ason that still, me thinks they run on, with a sound of one nature, & a
> of certaintie which stuffs the delight rather then entertaines it . . .
> . . And I must confesse my Adversary hath wrought this much upon me,
> I thinke a Tragedie would indeed best comporte with a blancke verse,
> ispence with Ryme, saving in the Chorus or where a sentence shall require
> plet.[1] And to avoid this over-glutting the eare with that alwayes certaine,
> ull incounter of Ryme I have assaide in some of my Epistles to alter the
> place of meeting, and to set it further off by one verse, to trie how I
> disuse my own eare, and to ease it of this continuall burthen, which
> le seemes to surcharge it a little too much, but as yet I cannot come
> ease myselfe therein; this alternate or crosse Ryme, holding still the
> place in my affection.[2]

he second departure of these three plays from the rest of the later
can group is in the use of simple stanza-forms, especially the
ne stanza, for the Choruses.

he interest of these departures lies not only in the fact that they
; to association between Greville and Daniel during their produc-
but also to the fact that they are traits of the English Senecan
of the Inns, and therefore indicate a return, in these respects at
, from the French model to the older English form. The use
oral abstractions, such as Time, Eternity, Malice, Craft, Pride,
ıpt Reason, and of spiritual beings such as Good and Bad Spirits,

---

[1] This principle of marking a 'sentence,' or maxim, by rhyme is more or
bserved in all the Senecan plays. It may be worth noting that the quota-
arks throughout Greville's works mean no more than that the words form
a 'sentence' or maxim.

[2] Hazlewood, *Anc. Crit. Essays*, as before, II, pp. 217-8. As the *Tancred and*
nda probably gave alternate-rhyming to the later Senecans, so it may
suggested the mixture of rhyme and blank verse to Greville and Daniel.
Wilmot in rewriting it in 1591 left part in alternate rhyme and converted
o blank verse. Kyd, in *one* scene of *Cornelia*, II, 1, has the same unregu-
that Greville and Daniel practise.

as the persons of the Choruses, is another feature of these three plays in which they agree with the older English form, and not with the other plays of this late 'school,' in which the persons of the Choruses are human beings, Roman soldiers, for example. Both of Greville's plays, therefore, and the *Philotas* of Daniel, although they were undoubtedly inspired by the later activity after the French, depart from the typical form peculiar to that activity and follow the form developed earlier in England itself.[1]

Before passing to the consideration of Greville's plays in particular, a slight digression may be indulged, to point out a possible sequel to the history of this later Senecan drama to which attention has not been called. Sir William Davenant was an inmate, part of the time a page, in Lord Brooke's house.[2] He knew of his later revision of his poems and criticised it in such a way as to show his thorough knowledge of what was done; and Lord Brooke's influence upon him has been traced in his thought. Davenant, moreover, showed great respect for both Daniel's theory and his practice in poetry. Is it unnatural to think that the pattern of these masters influenced him in his use of rhyme in dignified drama? If not, then the indirect influence of these writers upon the Heroic Drama of the Restoration follows; for Dryden justly called Davenant the father of the Heroic Drama.[3] At all events, there seems to be little room for doubt that Davenant shows the effect of Greville's instruction in his application of literary art to the illustration of political morality and philosophy; he may also have learned from Greville the possibilities of themes from Oriental history for this purpose; and both of these are lines of development that lead to the Heroic Drama.

Two plays of Greville's are extant. He wrote a third, the fate of which he describes thus:

> Lastly, concerning the Tragedies themselves; they were in their first creation three; Whereof *Antonie* and *Cleopatra*, according to their irregular passions, in forsaking Empire to follow sensuality, were sacrificed to the fire. The executioner, the author himselfe. Not that he conceived it to be a contemptible younger brother to the rest: but lest while he seemed to looke over much upward, hee might stumble into the Astronomers pit. Many members in that creature (by the opinion of those few eyes, which saw it) having some childish

---

[1] Dr. Lester places these three among the plays in the French form.

[2] See Aubrey's *Brief Lives*, ed. by Andrew Clark, 2 vols., Oxford, 1898, I, p. 204.

[3] In his *Of Heroic Plays*, 1672. He says also: "For Heroic Plays (in which only I have used it [rhymed verse] without the mixture of prose) the first light we had of them, on the English theatre, was from the late Sir William D'Avenant." *Essays of Dryden*, ed. W. P. Ker, 2 vols., 1900; I, p. 149.

wantonnesse in them, apt enough to be construed, or strained to a personating of vices in the present Governors, and government.

From which cautious prospect, I bringing into my minde the ancient Poets metamorphosing mans reasonable nature into the sensitive of beasts, or vegetative of plants; and knowing these all (in their true morall) to bee but images of the unequall ballance between humours and times; nature, and place. And again in the practice of the world, seeing the like instance not poetically, but really fashioned in the Earle of *Essex* then falling; and ever till then worthily beloved, both of *Queen*, and people: This sudden descent of such greatnesse, together with the quality of the Actors in every Scene, stir'd up the Authors second thoughts, to bee carefull (in his owne case) of leaving faire weather behind him.[1]

The meaning of this is a little covered up by the characteristic of some of Greville's prose which has caused him to be compared, unjustly, with Polonius, but it seems to justify the conclusion that the play was one of those containing disguised comment on the events of Essex' disgrace. The conclusion is not indeed on the face of the words, but on the other hand it was not the sort of thing which Greville wanted to make as plain as a church-steeple. Moreover, unless we adopt this opinion we must suppose that Greville's mind was ludicrously discursive. He is discussing his own works in order; coming to one of the plays, and telling why he destroyed it, he begins without a break, where our quotation ends, to give his views on the case of Essex's punishment, and to make it clear that he considered it undeserved. Then, lest this should be misinterpreted, he adds a long eulogy of Elizabeth's government, in his enthusiasm now actually losing sight of his connection. At last, after fifty-seven printed pages, he returns to his subject as follows:

Thus have I by the reader's patience, given that Aegyptian and Roman tragedy a much more honourable sepulture, then it could ever have deserved.[2]

It seems all but certain that his reason for destroying the play was the fear that was occasioned by the strict watch kept on books supposed to refer to Essex and Elizabeth. The point is of minor importance at best, however, in the case of a non-extant play; but this *Antonie and Cleopatra* is of some further interest, first because it can be exactly dated (if the phrase: 'Essex then falling,' is to be literally taken) in 1600-01, and secondly because it leaves no writer of this Senecan group who did not treat subjects of the period of the beginning of the Roman empire. Four of them treated the story of Antony's love.

Greville himself tells us something also about the two plays he

[1] *Life of Sidney*, ed. 1652, pp. 178-9; ed. Grosart, Vol. IV, pp. 155-6.
[2] Ibid., ed. 1652, p. 235; ed. Grosart, p. 214.

thought fit to preserve, *Alaham* and *Mustapha*, but before quoting what he says it will be best to tell what can be known of these plays from other sources. They differ from all others of their class in having the scene laid in little-known Oriental countries. The advantage of this delocalization, as it were, for the purpose of the creation of abstract types is evident, but Greville may have had the suggestion for the place from the Latin plays of the universities, in which subjects from Oriental history were not infrequently used. There is in fact in existence one of these plays, called *Solymannidae*,[1] in which the same historical events are dramatized as in *Mustapha*. This is not, however, the source of Greville's play. Several other possible sources have been suggested, only two of which need be discussed here. The first is a supplement added to H. Goughe's [or Goffe's] translation (1570) of Bartholomaeus Georgievitz' *De Turcarum Moribus, The Offspring of the House of the Ottomans* being the title of this translation. The title of the supplement is *The horrible acte, and wicked offence of Soltan Soliman Emperour of the Turkes, in murtheringe his eldest sonne Mustapha, the year of our Lorde 1553*. The fact that Daniel, in his *Defence of Ryme*, the work which he says he expanded from a letter written to Greville, mentions Georgievitz' book as an authority for his Oriental knowledge, leads one to think first of this as Greville's source. Dr. J. L. Haney, my fellow-student, examined this book for me in the British Museum and made a careful abstract of its contents. The second of the possible sources in question is the twelfth book of De Thou (Thuanus), *Historiae sui temporis*, the first part of which was published in 1604. Dr. Lester decides that the latter is the source, on the ground that here alone the names are as in Greville. He does not mention the other and probably therefore had not examined it. The names in this (Goughe, tr. Georgievitz) too are substantially the same as in Greville (*Rustanus* for *Rosten*, *Iangir* and *Giangir* for *Zanger*, etc.), and in the case of Greville's *Rossa* (in De Thou *Roxolana*, in Goughe *Rosa*) even much nearer. The features in which Goughe's narrative differs from Greville's are also different in De Thou, and these are probably to be explained on the ground that Greville modified the well-known story to suit his own purposes. At all events if De Thou is, as Dr. Lester supposes, Greville's main source, his substitution of the name *Rossa* for De Thou's *Roxolana* can only be

[1] See an art. in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch XXXIV, die lateinischen Universitäts-dramen Englands in der Zeit der Königin Elizabeth*, by Geo. B. Churchill and Wolfgang Keller, pp. 244-6. The authors point out that the Solyman of the play is Solyman II, the Great, who ascended the throne of his father Selim I in 1520.

accounted for by his having also used Goughe's supplement to Georgievitz or some other narrative related to it.

No source has been discovered for *Alaham*. The statement of Baker that the same story is told in Thomas Herbert's *A relation of some yeares travaile*,[1] 1634, though not really bearing on the question, has been several times repeated. An examination of the book reveals, however, that the story is not there. The narrative intended by Baker is probably that on pages 99 and following, in which events immediately preceding the accession of the then (1626) reigning sultan are related. These events are so like those of Mustapha's murder by his father that Herbert, though familiar with the Oriental courts, must in some way have confused the two. Baker either was thinking *Mustapha* when he wrote *Alaham*, or he was deceived by the superficial resemblance of a blinding in Herbert's story to the fact of the blinded father in *Alaham*. There seems to be some ground for the conjecture that in *Alaham* Greville made up a typical story out of various Oriental materials, including some of the well-known historical events that he also used in *Mustapha*. The great similarity of the characters and their relations to each other in the two plays is elsewhere pointed out, and the supposition that Greville is here adapting typical incidents from a variety of sources is further supported by their exact fitness to illustrate in detail his political philosophy as illustrated in the Treatises. He himself in a Chorus of *Alaham* describes exactly the abstraction each character is meant to represent. As to the picturesque detail of the drama, it seems traceable to a number of sources. The position of the heroine, whose name 'Caelica' suggests invention after an abstract idea, is strikingly similar to that of Antigone. The blind old king seems to be a reminiscence of the blind king of Paphlagonia in the *Arcadia*.[2] Further, the details of the poisoned shirt by which Cain dies and the concealment of the old king under the funeral pyre have parallels in classic legend and the plays of Seneca.

Of the two extant dramas, *Alaham* was first published in the Folio of 1633, and external evidence concerning its composition is almost wanting. *Mustapha*, however, was surreptitiously printed in 1609, and if the work of De Thou is a principal source of the play we have its early limit as 1604, since it is not likely that the work of this foreign

[1] *A relation of some years travaile, begunne Anno 1626.* London, 1634. In 1638 Herbert published an enlarged version of his work, with the title *Some yeares travel*, but this, though containing some new particulars of the *Mustapha* story, adds nothing concerning *Alaham*. See Baker's *Biog. Dram.*

[2] For the suggestion of the first of these points I am indebted to Prof. Schelling; for the second to a manuscript note by Miss Isabel Graves, author of an unpublished thesis on Sidney's Arcadianism.

scholar would have come into Greville's hands before it was printed. This evidence falls in with the fact that from James' accession Greville lived in retirement until 1614, and, by his own account, occupied his leisure in study. Of less certain value is the fact that *Mustapha* is written in a spirit of opposition to tyranny and apprehension of its effects, which is not shown in the same way in *Alaham* and which corresponds very well with his discontent with "those new revolutions of time," as he calls them, in the early years of James' reign.[1] So unequivocal were many of the expressions and whole passages of this kind in the 1609 Quarto that in preparing the play later for the collected edition of his works Greville cancelled the most dangerous of them,[2] possibly fearing to encourage the spirit of rebellion which was then abroad, possibly too because he understood the force of censorship under Laud.

Mustapha roughly placed, we turn to the internal evidence concerning *Alaham*. In discussing the *Sonnets* we spoke of the use of feminine lines as an indication of the time of writing of the various parts of the sequence, and a similar test is of service in the dramas. In *Alaham*, as we have said, there are exceedingly few feminine lines, the average falling even below that of the middle group of sonnets: one in the first act, four in the second, and so on. So marked is the absence of them, in fact, that in a poet who in general shows a fondness for the hendecasyllabic it is a sign of conscious avoidance in deference to a theory, and we have found the explanation of it in the parallel practice of Daniel and the statement he made concerning it. It was in 1594 or 1595 that Daniel, on a suggestion, as he says, by a friend, began the consistent omission of eleven-syllable lines in poems generally decasyllabic, and since he was then doubtless discussing the subject in conversation, it is possible that Greville at this time or soon after put the principle in practice in *Alaham*. This however is only a possibility. In *Mustapha* we have a different practice, both a general increase, though not very great, in the number of eleven-syllable lines and the definitely marked use of such lines, wholly or prevailingly, in certain scenes and passages,[3] a practice parallel with that of the latter part of the *Caelica* cycle.

---

[1] *Life of Sidney*, Grosart edition, IV, p. 215.

[2] See the Appendix to Vol. III of Grosart's edition, where the outspoken passages cancelled later are given, from a manuscript at Warwick Castle.

[3] The following are the scenes and passages in question:

I, l. 129 lines; 41 of 11 syllables, almost all occurring in groups of from four to thirteen lines.

II, l. 83 lines; 35 of 11 syllables, arranged as follows: 20 in first 25 lines, 3 in next 39, 12 in last 19.

That *Alaham* is at least an earlier play than *Mustapha* seems to be shown also by the evidence of style. Mr. Gosse says that "*Mustapha* has less rhyme introduced into it than *Alaham*, and has a somewhat more modern air."[1] The former of these statements is not borne out by a comparison, but the latter must be confirmed by the impression of every reader, and a careful examination shows some of the elements that go to produce this more 'modern' effect. In the first place, though both of the plays are strangely formal in style, in *Alaham* there is much greater use of rhetorical devices. These are principally rhetorical questions, antitheses, and apothegms, or "sentences," as they were then called. Argument is carried on almost exclusively by these means; even narrative advances in a series of rhetorical queries and maxims couched in a formal antithetic style; and the long monologues are in a kind of stichomythy of one. Though these assembled fragments of discourse are full of profound meaning, the mind wearies of the constrained and interrupted method of progression, and attention flags in the effort to unite the parts of the story. There is probably no play in the language in which it is harder to understand continuously what happens than *Alaham*. These characteristics are not all peculiar to *Alaham*, it is true, but in *Mustapha* they are considerably modified, and relieved by scenes in which syntax is continuous and argument moves naturally forward. All of the soliloquy of Achmat, Act II, Scene 1, is a case in point, and particularly the first 50 lines, in which there is neither a break in the grammatical connection, nor an interruption of the flow of thought; and an example in narrative style is the story of the murder of Mustapha told by Achmat to Zanger in V, 2. Apart from these characteristics of style, *Mustapha* is intellectually both more forceful and more simple than *Alaham*. Not only do the characters speak their feelings with less exaggeration and rhetorical 'gesture,' but more of the author's own emotion is in his thought, fusing it and reducing it to more natural forms. The figures are less rigid and monstrous, and the effect of the play is somewhat less like that of archaic sculpture. There is a difference, again, in the treatment of the subjects. In *Alaham* all the follies of public life are exposed impartially; but in *Mustapha* the tyranny of kings and priests is denounced with special earnestness. The hypocrisy of the church,

---

II, 3. A long scene with very few eleven-syllable lines except that 7-28 and 39-53 are all such.

V, 1. 17 lines; all eleven-syllable.

V, 2. 102 lines; 68 eleven-syllable.

These, as has been pointed out, are all passages of heightened emotion, unless possibly I, 1 be an exception.

[1] *Jacobean Poets*, p. 200.

which had been only vaguely hinted in *Alaham*, is revealed in every word of the Priest, with evident feeling on the author's part, and the play ends with the *Chorus Quintus* which won for Greville the titles 'impious' and 'skeptic' from some readers. It has already been pointed out that the denunciation of the church is a feature of the last group of sonnets, and of those alone, and in this respect, as well as in style, *Mustapha* seems to correspond with this part of the sequence, as *Alaham* does with the sonnets of the middle group, written, as we think, between 1586 and 1600.

The following is Greville's account of his plays:[1]

> Now to return to the Tragedies remaining, my purpose in them was, not (with the Ancient) to exemplifie the disastrous miseries of mans life, where Order, Lawes, Doctrine, and Authority are unable to protect Innocency from the exorbitant wickednesse of power, and so out of that melancholike Vision, stir [up] horrour, or murmur against Divine Providence: nor yet (with the Moderne) to point out Gods revenging aspect upon every particular sin, to the despaire, or confusion of mortality; but rather to trace out the high waies of ambitious Governours, and to shew in the practice, that the more audacity, advantage, and good successe such Soveraignties have, the more they hasten to their owne desolation and ruine.
>
> So that to this abstract end, finding all little instruments in discovery of great bodies to be seldome without errours, I presumed, or it rather escaped me, to make my Images beyond the ordinary stature of excesse. . . .
>
> Againe, for the Arguments of these Tragedies they be not naked, and casuall, like the Greeke, and Latine, nor (I confesse) contrived with the variety, and unexpected encounters of the Italians, but nearer Level'd to those humours, councels, and practices, wherein I thought fitter to hold the attention of the Reader, than in the strangeness or perplexedness of witty Fictions; in which the affections, or imagination, may perchance find exercise, and entertainment, but the memory and judgement no enriching at all; Besides, I conceived these delicate Images to be over-abundantly furnished in all Languages already.

Then follows the comparison between Sidney's writings and his own already quoted.

> . . . And if in this ordaining, and ordering matter, and forme together for the use of life, I have made theis Tragedies, no plaies for the stage, be it known, it was no part of my purpose to write for them, against whom so many good, and great spirits have already written.

The "high waies of ambitious governours" form the main subject of the Tragedies, but the folly of human desires would more nearly indicate the scope of their thought. The plans of the two plays are very similar. In each a weak tyrant occupies the throne, and the events illustrate the evils described as peculiar to that case in the

[1] *Life of Sidney*, ed. Grosart, pp. 220-3; ed. 1652, pp. 242 ff.

Treatise of Monarchy. In each case the most dangerous plotter is a woman who tries to alter the succession in the interest of her own son. In each there is a representative of the organized church, and two representatives of the faults of the nobility, and a daughter of the wronged king whose virtues are a foil to the mad vices of the other woman of the play. Finally, there is one good man in each, a counsellor of state; Mahomet Basha, in *Alaham*, seems to be such a character, but he is hazily represented and soon disappears from the scene; the aged counsellor Achmat in *Mustapha* is the one clearly-drawn representative of political virtue and wisdom in the plays, and it is interesting to observe that his conduct is exactly that which Greville advocates in the *Letter to an Honorable Lady*. He takes no part in the strife, and belongs to no party; he argues that the evils of the time offer no latitude for noble action, and finds his duty in 'bearing nobly.' It is he that reports the rising of the people at the end of the play and debates the significant question whether duty is on the side of obedience to authority or on the side of rebellion—with the conclusion that both are forms of folly and that the only wisdom is patience. He is a kind of Seneca, a representative of the Stoic wisdom, and clearly the projection of the author's own moral philosophy.

It is apparent that Greville's plays are intellectual in a different sense from all the other plays of the time. Daniel and Sir William Alexander induce abstract morality and philosophy from the particular cases they consider; Greville deduces character and all but the main outlines of the story from abstract thought. Greville's are therefore philosophical dramas in the exact sense, in the same sense in which Goethe's *Faust* and Browning's *Sordello* are philosophical, and it follows that they must be criticised in a different way from the other plays in the same form. We may wonder at other poets of the Elizabethan age who from no other motive than literary snobbishness preferred the outgrown Senecan form to the living drama of their day, but we cannot object to the use of such a form for the drama of philosophy. The fact that it is fixed in the mould of honorable disuse is its qualification for this service.

Again, there is some interest in remarking the peculiar fitness of Greville's thought for the dramatic mode of exposition. His interest in the strife of parties in the world, like that of Achmat in his play, is the observer's, and not the participant's. His belief in the depravity of man is not a theological convention, but a conviction which he carried into every field of thought and applied with a consistency of which few Calvinists can boast. His love for his unregenerate fellowmen has no other expression therefore than the counsel to repress their natural desires that they may suffer as little ill from them as possible;

and his method of illustrating this counsel in his plays is to create a number of types, each illustrating a ruling passion of men, endow them with a kind of personality, and impartially allow them to work out their own destruction together. The virtuous character, who should resist these errors and serve as a dramatic foil to them, is absent in these plays, or present only as passive victim or as spectator. Greville's very method, in short, is steeped in the Stoic irony of his thought, and if we substitute for the blind power of fate the blind law of human depravity, the similarity, which he himself notes, between the Greek tragedies and his own plays of Calvinistic pessimism is apparent. The method has the disadvantage, however, of obscurity. We believe, for instance, that Caelica, the daughter of the old king in *Alaham,* is a type of perfection, until we read in one of the Choruses that she represents an error to which good souls are liable, the error of proud resistance to the overwhelming evils of the world; and almost all Greville's readers have been misled because in the famous *Chorus Quintus* of *Mustapha* he left them to discover if they might that both the speakers represent forms of error. Greville has been repeatedly charged, on the ground of this Chorus, with the atheistical tendency which he exhibits, by the dramatic method, as a characteristic of his Mohammedan priests. This instance, indeed, is not within the dramatic action, but the Chorus itself is in dramatic form and it illustrates the obscurity in the plays due to the fact that the errors are controverted by other errors and not by the contrast with right. Greville, in short, has required more subtlety of puppets than puppetry is capable of.

The Choruses are not the least interesting parts of the plays, but their character is better illustrated by the discussion of the Treatises than by that of the plays themselves. They have the advantage over most of the Treatises, however, of subjects that reveal Greville's greatest qualities. A strife of words between bands of Good and Bad Spirits raises questions of human life and conduct to a sphere of infinite greatness, and a debate between Time and Eternity justifies the splendid expectations raised by its title. The eternal truths which find no place in the interplay of errors in the action of the dramas are vindicated in these choruses, and as the plays themselves show Greville's knowledge of the world, these show that he had the power to give imaginative reality to the spiritual ideals from which the world is sadly divorced.

III

THE TREATISES

The Folio edition of 'Lord Brooke's Works,' published in 1633, contained, besides the Sonnets and the Plays and the two Letters, the following works: *A Treatie of Humane Learning, An Inquisition upon Fame and Honour* and *A Treatie of Warres.* For some reason, perhaps because its political teaching would have been thought dangerous in the period between 1628 and 1640, Greville's largest work was not included in this volume, and in 1670 another volume appeared, containing *A Treatise of Monarchy* in fifteen sections, 664 stanzas, and *A Treatise of Religion.*[1] The external evidence concerning the date of these works is contained in Greville's statement that they were written with the intention of distributing them among the plays in the form of choruses, and that their disproportionate length for this purpose was due to his "apprehensive youth" wanting "a well touched compasse."[2] We have the same difficulty here that confronts us in all general references to age by the writers of the time. Looking backward from an age of perhaps seventy he might refer to the time when he was forty-five as his "apprehensive youth." The internal evidence seems to be more satisfactory; for, in the first place, there are mentions of Queen Elizabeth showing that she was dead at the time they were written,[3] secondly, an allusion to the excommunication of the State of Venice, which occurred in 1606,[4] and, finally, mention of the "late Fourth Henry," of France, who was assassinated in 1610.[5]

Unfortunately some doubt is thrown upon this evidence by the fact that Greville revised all his works in the latter part of his life and that this one, the *Treatise of Monarchy,* passed by his own account through several transformations. Taking up his "bear-whelp" again, he says, to lick it, he first cast it "into that hypocriticall figure Ironia," and then again, fearing it would seem light and irreverent, "forced in examples of the Roman gravity and greatnesse."[6] Dr. Grosart further confused the matter by some careless editing. In Volume IV of his edition, he gives an account of certain MSS. of Lord Brooke

[1] *The Remains of Sir Fulk Grevill Lord Brooke,* London, 1670. See Grosart ed., Vol. I.

[2] *Life of Sidney,* ed. 1652, pp. 173-4; ed. Grosart, IV, p. 150.

[3] *A Treatise of Monarchy,* st. 406.

[4] Ib., st. 214.

[5] Ib., st. 430.

[6] *Life of Sidney,* ed. 1652, p. 176; ed. Grosart, IV, p. 154.

preserved at Warwick Castle and sent to him for examination after he had published part of his edition. He describes and collates these MSS. fully. Of the volume containing the *Treatise of Monarchy* he says that it is written by a scribe, but contains corrections by the author in his own hand. The corrections are in details and expression, not in arrangement, omission, or addition, and the MS. must have been made after the larger alterations referred to by Greville. Yet Dr. Grosart says that "the corrections must have been made when our Worthy was young, corresponding as they do with his handwriting while still Mr. Fulke (or Foulke) Greville." This means that before 1597 Greville had already completed and had made corrections in a MS. containing mention of the "late Fourth Henry" of France; for this stanza is in the MS. in its present form and in the same hand with the rest, as are also the allusions to Queen Elizabeth and the excommunication of Venice. Something surely is wrong with Dr. Grosart's distinction between the early and the late penmanship of Lord Brooke. We can say with assurance concerning this MS., that it was made after 1610 and that it afterward received more than one revision from the author. Concerning the date of the writing of the treatise in which these allusions occur, the natural opinion is that they are safe guides; both the number of them and their naturalness in their connection make it probable that the passages in which they occur were written at the same time with the rest of the treatise, and that the whole poem therefore was written during Greville's period of retirement during the first ten years of the reign of James. The fact that they were intended as choruses of the tragedies is further evidence for this dating; for, as we have seen, *Mustapha* can be placed with certainty between 1604 and 1608. There are no indications of date in the other treatises, but they were all written in the maturity of the author's thought. The *Treatie of Warres* is a pendant of the *Treatise of Monarchy;* and the other three, on Fame, Learning, and Religion, are bound together by a similar method of treating the various subjects. The ironical contrast between practical wisdom and real truth characteristic of Greville's thought forms the basis of a dual division of the subject-matter of each of these treatises. They were evidently written during the same period of their author's life, and that, we may conjecture, a later period than is represented in any other whole work of his hand. They have, in common with those later sonnets of which we have spoken, greater fervor and spontaneity of utterance, both in the denunciation of the 'atheism' of churchmen and in the assertion of the true ideals of God's elect, than is to be found in any of the earlier sonnets or in the plays.

Their character and relations with other works of the time. Gre-

ville calls his work[1] on monarchy a changeling, both because of its deformities and because it was stolen from the Tragedies which gave it birth; and he gives a very particular account of its composition and various revisions, the gist of which is apparently an apology for the confusion between the words king and tyrant in certain parts of the work,—truly a dangerous kind of error. He says that having well "weigh'd the tendernesse of that great subject; . . . but especially the danger, by treading aside, to cast scandall upon the sacred foundations of Monarchy, a new counsell rose up in him to take away all opinion of seriousnesse from these perplexed pedegrees; and to this end carelessly cast them into that hypocriticall figure Ironia, wherein commonly men—to keep above their works—seeme to make toies of the uttermost they can doe." He returns to this apologetic tone in the next paragraph: "and like a man that plaies divers parts upon severall hints, [I] left all the indigested crudities, equally applied to kings or tyrants."

The confusion of which Greville speaks does in fact exist in the Treatise; the obscurity which most perplexes one in reading it is different from what is caused by condensed expression and close thought, or rather is in addition to this; it is obscurity due to a difference of method between the first and the second half of the work. The irony which Greville tries to pass off as mere trifling is all to be found in the sections 1-5 of the Treatise, which treat the following subjects: Declination of monarchy to violence, Weak-minded tyrants, Cautions against these weak extremities, Strong tyrants; and it was this part that Greville tried to qualify by his apology, and that did indeed excite wonder when it finally appeared because of its popular doctrine.[2] In the other sections, which are devoted to practical counsels for the various branches of government and orders of the commonwealth and to the 'Excellency of Monarchy,' Greville's attitude is quite different and not reproachable even in a member of the King's Council, but in these five he ironically espouses the cause of the tyrant and gives, first to the weak tyrant, and secondly to the strong, counsels by which they may maintain themselves against their subjects' efforts for freedom. He uses 'tyrant' in the present bad sense, and affects to be oblivious of the fact that all kings are not in this sense tyrants. It is evident that this part of his work, sections 1-5, is what Greville meant by

[1] He says: "that Treatise intitled the Declination of Monarchy," which is the name of one section of the *Treatise of Monarchy;* but the name properly describes the character of all the first half of the work (see below).

[2] Richard Baxter marvelled that it should have been 'allowed in this age.' *Poetical Fragments*, 1681, *Prefatory Address.* Reprinted in Brydges' *Restituta*, III, pp. 187-8.

"that Treatise intitled the Declination of Monarchy," and the difference in point of view between this and the rest of the Treatise can be explained by the fact that these parts were written independently of the rest for use in particular choruses of the plays.

There is another explanation of the peculiar cynicism of these sections, which Greville does not mention. A comparison shows that in these parts, but not markedly in others, he was following *The Prince* of Machiavelli.[1] The parallels are particularly close in the fifth section, *Of Strong Tyrants*, in which some of Machiavelli's familiar dicta are repeated with new illustrations: that princes must be neither contemptible nor odious (stanza 153), that pleasing vices are more useful than austere virtues (152), that a weak prince may find it useful to nourish factions in his realm in "mild times" (184). One of Machiavelli's precepts, however, Greville, writing for an English public, cannot approve even as a counsel of selfish wisdom, namely his famous rule that princes need not keep their promises.[2] "For what gains Power," he asks, "by loss of reputation?"

> Since every blossome that ill-doing bears
> Blasteth the fruit of good successe with feare.[3]

The Italian subtlety does not sit well, however, on Greville's shoulders, and he returns at the end of this part to his own franker method of reasoning, calling bad bad even when his practical counsels take him deepest into the mire of policy. Doubtless some sources for other parts of the Treatise could be found by patient study, but the literature of statecraft is so voluminous in this period that none but a specialist in that field can distinguish features of kinship; even Greville's position on the main question at issue in such discussions, the rights of the people, has been described in two contradictory ways. The mere statement that power is inherent in the governed is not distinctive, since it is found in almost all the political philosophers of the time, monarchists and democrats, Romanists and Protestants. Greville's opinions, however, considering that they are those of a professed monarchist, are often remarkably radical, and we may perhaps discover in them the influence of Languet, Sidney's friend and Greville's also, who wrote a book of broad democratic tenor in the interest of the

---

[1] *The Prince.* Morley's Universal Library, London, 1893.

[2] Sts. 164-175.

[3] Compare st. 93 with *The Prince*, Chap. IV, p. 93; 115-6 with P. Ch. XXV; 121 with P. xxii, p. 145; st. 132 with P. xxiii, p. 147; 135-7 with P. xx, pp. 131 and 133; 142 with P. p. 39; 149 with P. xv, p. 99; 150, couplet, with P. xxv, pp. 155-6.

French Huguenots.[1] A separate chapter on Greville's thought would be necessary in order to explain the confusion of opinion about his position, and to show what his attitude really was.

The other treatises, except that *Of Warre,* which is another treatment of the subject of one section of the *Treatise of Monarchy,* are connected by the similarity of thought which has been mentioned. All that needs to be said about those which treat the subjects of fame and religion comes under the head of Greville's thought, but the *Treatise of Humane Learning* has relations with other works of the time which give it particular interest.

The subject of the freedom and the power of the human reason was a storm-center of controversy in the Renaissance period. The interest in the subject was natural, and it was inevitable that the differences should be bitter; for the age was in the birth-throes of modern art and science. In England at the end of the sixteenth century, when the imagination had found a new and joyous freedom in lyric, romance, and drama, and the intellect was asserting its power in the science of Bacon, when a new physiology, a new physics, and a new astronomy were urging their claims upon men's minds, the controversy was warm in proportion to the amount of the fuel. The public and often violent disputes centering about the stage and involving men's thoughts concerning all of the fine arts, is too well known to be mentioned here, but an equally serious debate was going on quietly in the minds of the thoughtful and scholarly men of England concerning the validity of science and the new independence which the intellect was asserting for itself. Four works of the time familiar to students of literature argue the question in as many ways: Sir John Davies' *Nosce Teipsum,* the first part of which is on Human Knowledge, Daniel's *Musophilus,* Bacon's *Advancement of Learning,* and Greville's *Treatie,* three of them, if not all, written in the decade from 1595 to 1605, and all of them illustrating in many interesting ways the intellectual spirit of the age.

The least important for us is the first 'Elegy' of Davies' *Nosce Teipsum* (published in 1599), *Of Humane Knowledge.*[2] Like Pope's *Essay on Man,* it is a popular exposition of current ideas by a man who has no distinctive opinions. He argues that all learning is uncertain and vain except knowledge of self and God, and so far he is at one with Greville, but he maintains his argument with the agreeable assurance of a ready dialectician rather than with deep conviction.

---

[1] See *Biographie Universelle* (Michaud), Vol. 22.

[2] *The Complete Poems of Sir John Davies,* London, 1876, 2 vols., ed. by Dr. Grosart.

Daniel's *Musophilus*, or *A Generall Defence of all Learning*,[1] takes the other side of the question, as its title indicates, and has the special link with our subject of a dedicatory sonnet to Fulke Greville. This poem is a dialogue between Musophilus and one Philocosmus whose interest is all in useful learning and the weighty affairs of government. Musophilus answers the philosophical arguments of his opponent with the happy indifference of one who seeks no further than the finer pleasures of the world; his love for the "holy skill" of letters is independent alike of Bacon's practical utility and of the moral utility of Greville; the intellectual raptures of the scholar and the poet are superior to questions of use.

> Soul of the World, Knowledge, without thee
> What hath the world that truly glorious is?

Daniel had a subject after his own heart in the *Musophilus*. His intellectual refinement, his intelligent, and, as it were, historical appreciation of the charm of his own time, the qualities which distinguish Daniel as eminently the man of letters among the Elizabethan and Jacobean poets, are at their best in this poem; and in contrast with Greville's moral apprehension its spirit of liberal worldliness furnishes a measure of the intellectual range of the age.

The third of this group of works comes more directly into comparison with Greville's *Treatie*. The manifesto of the new science, Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*, appeared in 1605, and it is the opinion of its recent editor, Mr. W. Aldis Wright, that the first book was written in 1603. We know, however, that the materials of which it was made up had been in Bacon's mind for many years, and that he had previously written them down in other forms; and Greville may easily therefore have become acquainted with the contents of the book during the years of his intimacy with Bacon, which began before 1594. However that may be, it is certain that his *Treatie* is in part an answer to the *Advancement*, and also in part an echo of it. Greville was interested in the studies of Bacon in natural science, and particularly in the practical uses to which they might be applied; he was in sympathy with Bacon's attacks on the binding power of tradition, and the utilitarian zeal of the great experimenter found an echo in his humanitarian sympathies. He shows in both thought and phrase the deference he paid to his writings.[2] But on the subject of the 'proficiency' of

[1] Grosart's edition of Daniel.

[2] Compare T. of L. 25 and A. of L. (Works of Bacon, 3 vols. Philada., Vol. I) p. 170; T. of L. 39 and A. of L. pp. 162-3; T. of L. 17 and A. of L. 163; T. of L. 42-3 and A. of L. p. 164; T. of L. 74 and A. of L. p. 195; T. of L. 75-6 and A. of L. 172; T. of L. 131 and A. of L. p. 195; T. of L. 135 and A. of L. p. 176; T. of L. 142-3-5 and A. of L. p. 174.

learning, the scope of the powers of the mind, he takes issue with him, and opposes both empiric and *a priori* objections to his faith that the natural reason can discover unaided the "summary law of nature." An answer to Bacon's work in his own time, which is based on the argument that Bacon had no metaphysical ground for his science, seems to be worthy of more attention than it has received from historians of philosophy.[1]

[1] The neglect of Greville's philosophical writings by specialists in early English philosophy is probably due to his having written in verse; this treatise on learning accuses it, however, as an unjustifiable timidity or prejudice.

IV

THE PROSE WORKS

Greville's writings in prose include, first, a letter of advice to his cousin Greville Varney concerning the proper use of his opportunities of travel, dated Hackney, the 20th of November, 1609, an unimportant piece concerning which no more need be said; secondly, *A Letter to an Honourable Lady,* a long, yet unfinished, discourse printed in the Folio of 1633; and thirdly, *A Dedication to Sir Philip Sidney,* written for the collected edition of his works which Greville arranged for posthumous publication, but for some reason not included in the Folio volume of 1633.[1] It was published in a separate volume of 247 pages in 1652 under the somewhat misleading title, *The Life of the Renowned Sr. Philip Sidney,* with an Epistle Dedicatory to the Countess of Sunderland (Waller's 'Sacharissa') signed by one P. B.

It is a curious fact that few professed men of letters in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods made literary successes of their prose efforts. After *The Shepheardes Calender* poetry remained for many years the natural language of the literature of delight. Donne, for example, who had power equal to Swift's and as complete a mastery of worldly wisdom, is forgotten as a prose littérateur although he wrote two remarkable works of a satirical and speculative character in that medium; and Greville's one effort in formal prose, the *Letter* just mentioned, has attracted little more attention than is bestowed on a curiosity of literary history. This work must indeed always have been a curiosity, and it is curious to the point of ludicrousness if the opinion of Dr. Grosart, that it is addressed to a real lady, is correct. Dr. Grosart does not doubt that it was written for Lady Rich, Sidney's 'Stella,' in answer to a request from her for counsel in her marital troubles. But unhappily the facts of Penelope Devereux's married life would have to be very different to suit the case of this abused martyr-wife, who knows and has known no love but for her faithless husband. The fact is, notwithstanding some details that seem remarkably minute, that this is in all probability a philosophical epistle suggested by similar works of Roman moralists. Plutarch might have given the idea of the form to Greville, or, as is more probable, it is another sign of his admiration of his political and literary hero, Seneca, whose letters were only less popular than his plays among the educated people of the time. The facts of the lady's life are an invention of Greville's

[1] *The Short Speech for Bacon* (Grosart, IV, pp. 327-9) may be disregarded.

to illustrate what he thought was the case of the pure soul in an evil world; and by a strange kind of parallelism, these sad domestic events are made to represent at the same time the conditions to which an upright statesman is exposed in an age of tyranny and corruption. The work is in fact an attempt in another literary form at the same object attained in the dramas, philosophical exposition by means of concrete figures and in a formal artistic guise; and it illustrates not less remarkably the subtlety of Greville's mind in this kind of exercise. As to its philosophic teaching, it deserves more attention—as do Greville's other works—than students of philosophy, repelled by its amateur form, have accorded it. It supplements the negative teaching of the plays, and reveals that Greville's principles were those of the extreme form of Stoicism. Sejanus and Brutus for taking arms against the troubles of their times are condemned as examples of folly. Seneca, in politics, Octavia, in domestic life, are the true heroes of an evil age and an evil world, because they had the supreme virtue of "bearing well," and living their true lives detached. The doctrine of detachment is carried to a point where it is hard to distinguish it from the non-resistance of Quakerism; and it is interesting to note a tradition due to Davenant that Greville believed a kind of Quakerism would be the final settlement of religion in England.

The *Life of Sidney* is one of those works, like Lord Herbert's *Autobiography* and Izaak Walton's *Lives,* in which the authors have thrown aside formal rules of literary composition to give a familiar account of events and characters of personal interest to them and their times. They illustrate the uncritical character of the biographical essay of the time and its license as to digression and inclusion; but they are live and direct records of loyal enthusiasm or frank human nature, and later ages have enjoyed them for their humanity and profited by their essential truthfulness. This work was written very near the end of Lord Brooke's life, when he could speak of all his other writings as the work of his inexperienced youth, probably twenty years after the death of Elizabeth and forty years after the skirmish at Zutphen. Though written as a dedication to "that Worthy Sir Philip Sidney, so long since departed," it is in fact a historical work consisting of several parts. It contains, first, an encomium of Sidney, an account of his diplomatic activity, a narrative of other events in his life in which Greville was associated, and of his death;[1] secondly, a temperate vindication of Essex;[2] thirdly, a review of Elizabeth's policy;[3] and, fourthly,

[1] Grosart's edition, IV, pp. 1-145; ed. 1652, pp. 1-166.
[2] Ib., pp. 157-182; ed. 1652, pp. 181-207.
[3] Ib., pp. 183-214; ed. 1652, pp. 208-235.

an account of Greville's own works.[1] The *Life* is in fact Greville's historical legacy, and it contains the salvage of an important work which, as he tells us, he began, but never carried to completion. In the years of his private life after the accession of James, when his dissatisfaction with the government kept him out of active political service, he decided to find occupation in writing a life of Elizabeth. He planned his history from the beginning of the Tudor dynasty through the reign of the Queen, and applied to the Secretary, the younger Cecil, for access to the documents. The Cecils had little liking for Greville, and he no more for them than a loyal friend of Essex was likely to have; and the Secretary, fearing what such a writer might make of certain events still fresh in memory, put barriers in the way of his use of the records which made Greville give up the plan. The review of the policy of Elizabeth in the latter part of the *Life* is his substitute for this unfinished, or projected, history.

There is none of Lord Brooke's writings that we should more regret to lose than this one. It is the source of the classical story of Sidney's death, which Greville tells with quaint and pathetic circumstantiality, and with the realism in physical details which was natural rather than grotesque to the feeling of the age; it is the best likeness of the young "president of learning and chivalry" which has been left us by a contemporary; it gives a view of the Essex case which is equally creditable to the author and to the subject of it; and it is a remarkable testimony by an experienced statesman to the greatness of Elizabeth's government. All these things give it documentary interest, but as a memorial of friendship it is worthy of a place among the classics of human history. There was no title Greville desired more than that which Walpole gave him with a smile, "satellite of Sidney;" he showed that he envied that title in his sonnets; in the *Elegy*, which Lamb's intuition ascribed to Greville's hand; in some letters, happily preserved, written soon after the news of Sidney's death; in the plans of which we read in another letter twenty-five years after Sidney's death, for a monument of "touch" with four pillars of solid brass, to cover a common tomb for himself and his friend in St. Paul's Cathedral; and in the actual inscription on his tombstone in St. Mary's Church in Warwick: 'Friend of Sir Philip Sidney'.[2] He wrote, therefore, with the sincerity of a

[1] Grosart's edition, pp. 146-157 and 214-219; ed. 1652, pp. 167-180, 235-247.

[2] The following letter, written to Archibald Douglas, the Scottish ambassador at London, two months after the news of Sidney's death, speaks for itself:

1586 (Oct.). My Lord,—I go no whither, therefore I beseech you pardon me that I visit you not. The only question I now study is whether weeping sorrow, or speaking sorrow, may most honour his memory, that I think death is sorry for. What he was to God, his friends and country, fame hath told,

life-long devotion when he inscribed these "toyes and pamphlets" to his memory, "as monuments of true affection between us; whereof (you see) death hath no power." The *Life* is a work besides to win admiration by its own literary qualities. It contains a number of passages written with remarkable vividness and power of description, in particular Greville's audience with William of Orange, Elizabeth's attempts to prevent Greville from engaging in foreign adventure, and the story of Sidney's campaign in the Netherlands before his death; almost every page has instances of Greville's peculiar eloquence of phrase; and the whole work commands admiration as an archaic but noble expression of the same spirit of chivalry that animated Sidney and Spenser, with an added touch of pathos derived from the character of its author and the sadder times through which he survived.

These two works have a technical interest as examples of the prose style of their period which the literary historian dares not disregard. But he finds the same difficulties in attempting to speak instructively of their qualities as prose literature that are encountered by all critics who attempt to deal seriously with the prose of the century before the Restoration. Whether or not it is due to the vagueness inherent in the subject, the fact is apparent that the intelligent generalizations which are the object of literary history have not been made in this field of study, except for certain formalists who are easily classified. This condition is apparent for example in the comments of the various writers in Mr. Henry Craik's recent anthology, and is strikingly illustrated in the discussion of Greville himself. We read there the following sentence: "In him appears the beginning of that strange inability to confine oneself to a simple sentence which, not apparent at all in much earlier work, seems to have come upon Englishmen in the reign of Elizabeth, and from which they hardly got free till the reign of William the Third." It is not necessary to controvert a statement in which works written well on in the reign of James are considered as the first examples of a fault that appeared in the reign of Elizabeth. If Greville is the first, what shall be said of Raleigh? In this deliverance, moreover, Professor Saintsbury is justified by only one of the two prose

---

though his expectation went beyond her good. My Lord, give me leave to join with you in praising and lamenting him, the name of whose friendship carried me above my own worth, and I fear hath left me to play the ill poet in my own part. Well, my Lord, divide me not from him, but love his memory, and me in it. I shall not see your lordship so oft as I would do if you were yourself. It is enough I wish you honour and love you. From my lodge this night. Your lordship's friend, Foulk Grevill.

P.S.—I was but gone to take air in the park when it pleased you to call. —*Hist. MSS. Comm.*, as above.

works of Greville, the *Life of Sidney*, written very late in his life, possibly in the reign of Charles. In this personal record, the memoirs, as it professes to be, of an old man, the privilege of discursiveness is indeed assumed and abused. It has already been noticed that the discussion of Essex' case is a digression of fifty pages in an account of Greville's own works. And in paragraphs and sentences there is the same looseness of structure. Clauses, explanatory and parenthetic, accumulate and are developed to elaborate climaxes, which exhaust the force that should carry the sentence on to completion, and progress is resumed with an "and so, I say." But it is careless reading that does not show the direct contrast in these respects between the *Life* and the *Letter*. In the formal epistle Greville is under the authority of a literary convention not less exacting than the Senecan play or the sonnet. He lays out at the beginning a logical plan to which he adheres so faithfully that we are able to say that the work, though unfinished, was nearing completion. The sentences too are not only planned, but are constructed with rigid formality. So far from being loose and licentious, the character of this prose, the quality that we must distinguish it by, is that of a highly artificial and regulated product.

"The want of fluency and ease" is the special defect that Professor Saintsbury notes as the offset to the merits of Greville's prose. The quality he describes thus is indeed notably present in it, but when he characterizes it as a defect "natural to a language which was hardly yet out of leading-strings, but endeavouring at independence," he seems to fall into error through an imperfection—for the nonce—of historical sympathy. To say that Greville wrote without fluency and Sidney artificially because of incapacity in themselves or their mother-tongue is hardly nearer the real truth of the matter than to say that they wore swords and embroidered garments because they had nothing else to wear. For Greville's prose and the prose of the *Arcadia*, with all their differences, fall in the same general class, namely prose deliberately fashioned and unsimple, and adapted to the requirements of a courtly skill. A style developed as a courtly or amateur accomplishment is usually marked by idiotisms and extravagances. It is never a convenient work-a-day costume. It is 'costly' and splendid, with peculiar refinements and distinguishing ornaments that are commonly not beautiful in themselves; and its whole effect is lost or turned to absurdity unless it is graced by the breeding of the wearer.

Greville's prose has the characteristics of such a style, and particularly, of course, those of the courtly taste of his own time, but with an archaic preference, it would seem, in works written deep in the Jacobean period, for the peculiarities of the courtly style of the period of his youth. Analyzed more closely, it reveals several traits that contribute

to its effect of stateliness, and also to its obscurity. It is enriched with adjectives and adverbs that curb and regulate the pace, and tend to maintain a uniform stately rhythm in the sentences; secondly, it is complexly figurative, or, to be more exact, it is a rich tissue of figures; thirdly, it is marked by intentionally quaint and often very puzzling curiosity, or pedantry, of diction; and, fourthly, there is a marked tendency to artificial arrangement of phrases, in which parallelism and likeness of construction give point to subtle variations and contrasts, this being the trait, it will be observed, that most clearly connects it with the Arcadianism of Sidney.

These characteristics are illustrated in the following passages—the first a description of the golden age:

> In this estate of mindes, onely gouerned by the vnwritten lawes of Nature, you did at the beginning live happily together. Wherein there is a lively image of that Golden Age, which the allegories of the poets figure vnto vs. For there Equality guided without absolutenesse, Earth yeelded fruit without labour, Desert perished in reward, the names of Wealth and Poverty were strange, no owing in particular, no private improuing of humors, the traffick being loue for loue; and the exchange all for all: exorbitant abundance being neuer curious in those selfe-seeking arts, which teare up the bowels of the Earth for the priuate use of more than milke and hony.[1]

The other illustrates the closeness and mysteriousness of Greville's thought, and is a characteristic expression of his philosophy of life.

> Therefore since power lies in him, desire and dutie in you; pay your tribute, doe your homage, and make your reward to bee the secret peace of well-doing; cutting off all other thoughts of rest by him, who not having it himselfe, cannot possibly bestow it vpon others. For by that meanes your honour will bee safely guarded from these muddy visions of Hope, which—as I said—is one chiefe pillar in incroaching power; and in which the fooles of the world, sleeping away their liberties, doe vainely make Authorities their heires.[2]

Curiosity and intentional indirectness of utterance are obviously characteristic of these passages. The description of the monopolists, for example, who dig in the earth for "more than milk and honey," owes its effect to its calculated strangeness and obscurity, and in another place Greville runs still closer into the wind of incomprehensibility when he says of monopolists and tyrants that they would "[draw] up our brows after our sweat, and [give] laws to thirst as well as drinking." The figurativeness of his style is also evident. Metaphor, as it is here used, is not a means of enlightenment; nor is it mere ornament in any ordinary sense. It is a way of veiling thought to add to its significance,

[1] Works, Grosart ed., Vol. 4, pp. 235-6.
[2] Ib., Vol. 4, p. 270.

an appeal to the subtler and more mystical reason, a kind of labyrinthine device guarding the mysteries of truth from indifferent approach. These qualities, with the others described above, are not the kind of qualities that are due to negligence or immaturity. They are plainly characteristics of a courtly style formed in an age in which the splendid artifices of chivalry still survived.

But it is the paradox of Greville's writings that while they are outwardly conventional and rigidly artificial, the personal quality in them is subtlety and inwardness of thought; and the real explanation of the strange individuality of his style is to be sought in his own unique temperament, which imposed a new character upon the forms and conventions to which it submitted itself. Undoubtedly something of personal defect enters into his strangeness and obscurity. He lacked the tact and skill of the expounder, the deftness and facility that still give a kind of currency to the superficial *Nosce Teipsum* of Sir John Davies, and the capacity for the "lighter steps of fancy," which completes the character of the 'courtier' in Sidney. Looked at with unfriendly eyes, the lack of tact and natural lightness, of adaptability to times and conditions, might seem to be the secret of his personality and of his career, as well as of his works. It certainly explains the break with his age which withdrew him from public life at the height of his career. But on the other hand this deficiency is closely associated with the quality that makes him so interesting to those who take the pains to understand him. It is the sign of something nobly impractical and unconforming in the character of this practical, skeptical statesman. So far as he failed in his public career, his failure was due to his devotion, perhaps we may say his fantastic devotion, to ideals, and his inability to find in the world as it then was any bonds of connection with them.

A full discussion of Greville's thought would demand more space than we can command; but enough may be briefly indicated to throw some light on the personality that informs his writings. The characteristic trait of his discussion of all subjects of moral and political philosophy is the dual division of the subject-matter, due to two distinct ways of viewing the same phenomena. He himself makes the division and will never allow it to become obscured. One of the two points of view is that of the practical statesman or man of the world, and in this aspect of his thought Greville is so ironical, so skeptical, that, as we have seen, he was confuted by a great ecclesiastic as a free-thinker. He scoffed at the notion of special sanctions for monarchs and monarchy; he scoffed at the "high philosophy," the "guile that is beguiled," and refuted Bacon's contention that human reason was capable of discovering the real laws of nature; and what is more significant in his age, he denied to all churches alike, Roman, Puritan, Anglican, and to

any possible church, a divine appointment and the right to the allegiance of true souls. In the independence of his views he keeps pace with all that is maintained by skeptics like Montaigne as signs of their professed character, and he far surpasses them in bitter denunciation of the vices of kings and churches. But, on the other hand, Greville is not a skeptic. An interesting comparison has been drawn between the opinions of Voltaire and Dr. Johnson in their most characteristic works to show that their views of the world are not dissimilar; and Greville's irony and gloom are like Johnson's in that they coexist with a positive system of beliefs. Johnson, however, stopped his questioning at the doors of certain established institutions; while Greville spares nothing but the experience of the free individual soul. The positive side of his thought appears in the second of the two detached parts into which he divides most of his treatises. It is here that he considers truth and wisdom as they appear to those whom he calls variously the "real souls," the "good," and the "elect," and we have seen in the discussion of the *Letter* what that truth and wisdom seem to him to be. These elect have nothing in common with the world but the common fact of humanity and the duty of pitying but hopeless service. Their first duty is their own spiritual freedom, and this, being wise spirits, they win by outward obedience to whatever tyrannical authority is over them; they pay their tribute and seek their peace within, where alone the springs of true peace are to be found. Of course this division of the race into classes by lines of cleavage visible only to the purely spiritual eye now seems to the world somewhat impractical, much too absolute, and dependent upon personal aberrations of vision; but it is plain that in Greville's case it was a deep personal conviction with its roots in his temperament and character. We trace both its causes and its effects in the dissatisfaction with the world that is the constant note of his letters, in the separation from the active spirit of his age that widened as he grew older, and in his actual retirement at the age of fifty for a period of eleven years. We find too the soil in which this conviction grew in those nobler traits of his character that made him a worshipper of heroes, a fanciful idealizer of his friends, and a devoted partisan of the past, almost, in fact, a dweller in it, as he himself confessed.

He doubtless felt that his opinions were those of the age of Elizabeth, and he certainly believed them to be in contrast with those of the age of James and Charles. But he could not stop the course of time or prevent its effects upon his own character. His very attitude of opposition, indeed, brings into his thought the qualities of spiritual depth and moral concern that belong especially to the seventeenth century, while the end at which all his reflection aimed, the spiritual freedom of the individual soul, is the central thought of Puritanism. He has some-

thing more than the ingenious and subtle depth of the metaphysical Jacobeans, and strikes such notes of moral anger and spiritual emotion as are heard in the prose works of Milton. It is impossible to read the passage in which he describes the moral purpose of his works, in which he professes, with astonishing eloquence and the very intonation of sincerity, to speak to none on whose foot the Black Oxe of care hath not trod, without feeling that we have parted, as Mrs. Ward has said, from the age of Sidney and Spenser, and are in the midst of an age far less eager and heart-free.

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED THE COST OF OVERDUE NOTIFICATION IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW.

CANCELLED
FEB 5 1978
NOV 22 1978

WIDENER
CANCELLED
NOV - 4 1986

CANCELLED
MAY 21 1987
JUN - 6 1987
23183